

JULY 1952

ROOM 108

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

A PLATFORM FOR THE FREE DISCUSSION OF
ISSUES IN THE FIELD OF RELIGION AND
THEIR BEARING ON EDUCATION

JULY - AUGUST 1952



REVISED STANDARD VERSION OF THE BIBLE
A Symposium

THE WORD OF LIFE
A Symposium

BOOK REVIEWS

Religious Education

Official Publication of the Religious Education Association

Seeks to present, on an adequate, scientific plane, those factors which make for improvement in religious and moral education. The Journal does not defend particular points of view, contributors alone being responsible for opinions expressed in their articles. It gives its authors entire freedom of expression, without any official endorsement. Articles in Religious Education are indexed in the EDUCATION INDEX which is on file in educational institutions and public libraries.

Membership in the Association is \$5.00 or more per year.
Single copies of Religious Education, \$1.00 each.

HERMAN E. WORNOM, General Secretary
Suite 8G, 545 West 111th Street,
New York 25, N. Y.

LEONARD A. STIDLEY, Editor
Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

LEONARD A. STIDLEY, Dean and Professor of Religious Education, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, Chairman.

EDNA L. ACHISON, First Unitarian Church, Chicago, Ill.

EMANUEL GAMORAN, Commission on Jewish Education, New York City.

WALTER M. HORTON, Professor of Systematic Theology, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

THOMAS S. KEPLER, Professor of New Testament, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

HERBERT G. MAY, Professor of Old Testament, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

EMMA FRANK, Librarian, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

The Religious Education Association

General Secretary and Business Office, Suite 8G, 545 W. 111th Street,
New York 25, N. Y.

Editorial and Publication Office, 29 N. Pleasant St., Oberlin, Ohio

Printed at 48 S. Main Street, Oberlin, Ohio

Published bi-monthly. Printed in the U. S. A.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

VOLUME XLVII

JULY-AUGUST, 1952

NUMBER 4

CONTENTS

	Page
Revised Standard Version — A Symposium	
I Preface to the Revised Standard Version	243
II The Use of the Versions in the Revised Standard Version	Fleming James 248
III The Use of the Versions in Translating the Holy Scriptures	Harry W. Orlinsky 253
IV The Literary Values of the Revised Standard Version	James Muilenburg 260
V Recently Discovered Manuscripts and the Revised Standard Version	John C. Trever 265
VI Some Religious Education Values of the Revised Standard Version with Special Reference to the Book of Amos, <i>Herbert G. May</i>	272
The Word of Life — A Symposium	
I The Word of Life — What is It?	John C. Trever 278
II The Word of Life — Know It	Ralph D. Heim 282
III The Word of Life — Share It	Merrill Powers 287
IV The Word of Life — Live It	Rueben H. Mueller 292
Book Reviews	297

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Please notify RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, Suite 8G 545 West 111th Street, New York 25, N. Y., of change of address, giving both old and new addresses.

Send notification of change of address at least four weeks in advance. The United States Post Office does not automatically forward second class matter.

Entered as second-class matter, January 23, 1948, at the Post Office at Oberlin, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Business Office of R.E.A. Moved to New York City

President Samuel P. Franklin announced that the Business Office in Chicago had been combined with the Office of the General Secretary in New York City, on July 1, 1952.

In recent years the official work of the R.E.A. has been done in four widely separated centers; (1) The Office of the General Secretary in New York City, (2) The Mid-Century Expansion Drive in Pittsburgh, Pa., (3) The Business Office in Chicago, and (4) The Editorial work and Publication of *Religious Education* in Oberlin, Ohio.

The Mid-Century Expansion Drive has been successfully completed. So in the interest of efficiency the Board of Directors took action to unite the Chicago office with the Office of the General Secretary. All R.E.A. correspondence is to be handled through the New York office with the exception of the Editorial and Publication work which remains in Oberlin, Ohio.

The address of the Office of the General Secretary is:

Suite 8 G, 545 West 111 Street,
New York 25, New York.

In closing the Chicago Office President Franklin expressed the appreciation of the Board of Directors to those officers of the R.E.A. in Chicago who have handled the business of the R.E.A. so effectively. President Franklin stated: "The R.E.A. owes a large debt of gratitude to Professor Ernest J. Chave of the University of Chicago. As Chairman of the R.E.A. Finance Committee, he has kept in close touch with the business affairs of the Association for many years. In 1948 after the death of Dr. Laird T. Hites, Professor Chave personally conducted the R.E.A. business operations. Otto Mayer became Business Manager in February 1949 and since then he and Mrs. Mayer, under Professor Chave's supervision, have given careful attention to all of the business details of distributing *Religious Education*, of keeping the membership lists up-to-date, of soliciting subscriptions, and of diligently handling the finances and books of the corporation. Dr. Merrill Powers has also given faithful service as Treasurer. The continuance and growth of the R.E.A. has been due to the faithful and efficient work of those officers who through the Chicago office carried on the basic work of the R.E.A. We are deeply indebted to them for their services to the R.E.A."

Planning Committee for Observance of 50th Anniversary Begins Work

President Samuel P. Franklin has announced the appointment of the New York City Committee of the Planning Committee to Observe the 50th Anniversary of the Religious Education Association. Dr. F. Ernest Johnson is chairman of the Committee. (The members of the Committee are listed on the inside back cover of this number of *Religious Education*.) Other associate members from various sections of the country will be appointed as rapidly as possible.

The first meeting of the Planning Committee was held at Corpus Christi Rectory in New York City on May 29, 1952. The following items were voted. (1) A Convention to observe the 50th Anniversary will be held in the first half of November, 1953. (2) The tentative theme for the Convention is; "Religious Education for the American People in the 20th Century." (3) A year's intensive effort is to be given to the strengthening of local chapters. (4) As soon as possible scholars and leaders are to be secured to write critical papers dealing with basic problems and underlying assumptions in various areas of religious education in our time. These papers are to be made available to local chapters for program planning.

The remainder of 1952 and the year of 1953 will be significant in the history of the Religious Education Association, as plans for the Observance of the 50th Anniversary mature.

— THE EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

The Revised Standard Version of the Bible

A SYMPOSIUM

On September 30, 1952, the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, upon which the Standard Bible Committee has been working for over fifteen years, will be published.

After this important date the Holy Bible, as revised by the Standard Bible Committee, will be made available. Religious educators will have an unparalleled opportunity with the publication of the Revised Standard Version. To clarify this opportunity the Editorial Committee enlisted the cooperation of five members of the Committee and the representative of the Committee to provide insights into the forthcoming Revised Standard Version. We are deeply indebted to these scholars for their cooperation in furnishing these stimulating articles.

Dr. Luther A. Weigle, chairman of the Committee, had been asked to write an article. He graciously furnished the Preface to the forthcoming Revised Standard Version and also secured permission from Thomas Nelson and Sons for its printing in this issue. We thank Dr. Weigle for this warm cooperation.

—The Editorial Committee

I

PREFACE TO THE REVISED STANDARD VERSION

THE REVISED Standard Version of the Bible is an authorized version of the American Standard Version, published in 1901, which was a revision of the King James Version, published in 1611.

The first English version of the Scriptures made by direct translation from the original Hebrew and Greek, and the first to be printed, was the work of William Tyndale. He met bitter opposition. He was accused of willfully perverting the meaning of the Scriptures, and his New Testaments were ordered to be burned as "untrue translations." He was finally betrayed into the hands of his enemies, and in October, 1536, was publicly executed and burned at the stake.

Yet Tyndale's work became the foundation of subsequent English versions, notably those of Coverdale, 1535; Thomas Matthew (probably pseudonym for John Rogers), 1537; the Great Bible, 1539; the Geneva Bible, 1560; and the Bishops' Bible, 1568. In 1582 a translation of the New Testament, made from the Latin Vulgate by Roman Catholic scholars, was published at Rheims.

The translators of the King James Version took into account all of these preceding versions; and comparison shows that it owes something to each of them. It kept felicitous

phrase and apt expressions, from whatever source, which had stood the test of public usage. It owed most, especially in the New Testament, to Tyndale.

The King James Version had to compete with the Geneva Bible in popular use; but in the end it prevailed, and for more than two and a half centuries no other authorized translation of the Bible into English was made. The King James Version became the "Authorized Version" of the English-speaking peoples.

The King James Version has with good reason been termed "the noblest monument of English prose." Its revisers in 1881 expressed admiration for "its simplicity, its dignity, its power, its happy turns of expression . . . the music of its cadences, and the felicities of its rhythm." It has entered as no other book into the making of the personal character and the public institutions of the English-speaking peoples. We owe to it an incalculable debt.

Yet the King James Version has grave defects. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the development of Biblical studies and the discovery of many manuscripts more ancient than those upon which the King James Version was based, made it manifest that these defects are so many and so serious

as to call for revision of the English translation. The task was undertaken, by authority of the Church of England, in 1870. The English Revised Version of the Bible was published in 1881-1885; and the American Standard Version, its variant embodying the preferences of the American scholars associated in the work, was published in 1901.

Because of unhappy experience with unauthorized publications in the two decades between 1881 and 1901, which tampered with the text of the English Revised Version in the supposed interest of the American public, the American Standard Version was copyrighted, to protect the text from unauthorized changes. In 1928 this copyright was acquired by the International Council of Religious Education, and thus passed into the ownership of the churches of the United States and Canada which were associated in this Council through their boards of education and publication.

The Council appointed a committee of scholars to have charge of the text of the American Standard Version and to undertake inquiry as to whether further revision was necessary. For more than two years the Committee worked upon the problem of whether or not revision should be undertaken; and if so, what should be its nature and extent. In the end the decision was reached that there is need for a thorough revision of the version of 1901, which will stay as close to the Tyndale-King James tradition as it can in the light of our present knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek texts and their meaning on the one hand, and our present understanding of English on the other.

In 1937 the revision was authorized by vote of the Council, which directed that the resulting version should "embody the best results of modern scholarship as to the meaning of the Scriptures, and express this meaning in English diction which is designed for use in public and private worship and preserves those qualities which have given to the King James Version a supreme place in English literature."

Thirty-two scholars have served as members of the Committee charged with making

the revision, and they have secured the review and counsel of an Advisory Board of fifty representatives of the co-operating denominations. The Committee has worked in two Sections, one dealing with the Old Testament and one with the New Testament. Each Section has submitted its work to the scrutiny of the members of the other Section, however; and the charter of the Committee requires that all changes be agreed upon by a two-thirds vote of the total membership of the Committee. The Revised Standard Version of the New Testament was published in 1946. The publication of the Revised Standard Version of the Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, was authorized by vote of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. in 1951.

The problem of establishing the correct Hebrew and Aramaic text of the Old Testament is very different from the corresponding problem in the New Testament. For the New Testament we have a large number of Greek manuscripts, preserving many variant forms of the text. Some of them were made only two or three centuries later than the original composition of the books. For the Old Testament only late manuscripts survive, all (with the exception of the Dead Sea texts of Isaiah and Habakkuk and some fragments of other books) based on a standardized form of the text established many centuries after the books were written.

The present revision is based on the consonantal Hebrew and Aramaic text as fixed early in the Christian era and revised by Jewish scholars (the "Masoretes") of the sixth to ninth centuries. The vowel-signs, which were added by the Masoretes, are accepted also in the main, but where a more probable and convincing reading can be obtained by assuming different vowels, this has been done. No notes are given in such cases, because the vowel points are less ancient and reliable than the consonants.

Departures from the consonantal text of the best manuscripts have been made only where it seems clear that errors in copying had been made before the text was standardized. Most of the corrections adopted are based on the ancient versions (transla-

tions into Greek, Aramaic, Syriac, and Latin), which were made before the time of the Masoretic revision and therefore reflect earlier forms of the text. In every such instance a footnote specifies the version or versions from which the correction has been derived, and also gives a translation of the Masoretic Text.

Sometimes it is evident that the text has suffered in transmission, but none of the versions provides a satisfactory restoration. Here we can only follow the best judgment of competent scholars as to the most probable reconstruction of the original text. Such corrections are indicated in the footnotes by the abbreviation *Cn*, and a translation of the Masoretic Text is added.

The discovery of the meaning of the text, once the best readings have been established, is aided by many new resources for understanding the original languages. Much progress has been made in the historical and comparative study of these languages. A vast quantity of writings in related Semitic languages, some of them only recently discovered, have greatly enlarged our knowledge of the vocabulary and grammar of biblical Hebrew and Aramaic. Sometimes our translation will be found to render a Hebrew word in a sense quite different from that of the traditional interpretation. It has not been felt necessary in such cases to attach a footnote, because no change in the text is involved and it may be assumed that the new rendering was not adopted without convincing evidence. The analysis of religious texts from the ancient Near East has made clearer the significance of ideas and practices recorded in the Old Testament. Many difficulties and obscurities, of course, remain. Where the choice between two meanings is particularly difficult or doubtful, we have given an alternative rendering in a footnote. If in the judgment of the Committee the meaning of a passage is quite uncertain or obscure, either because of corruption in the text or because of the inadequacy of our present knowledge of the language, that fact is indicated by a note. It should not be assumed, however, that the Committee was entirely sure or unanimous

concerning every rendering not so indicated. To record all minority views was obviously out of the question.

A major departure from the practice of the American Standard Version is the rendering of the Divine Name, the "Tetragrammaton." The American Standard Version used the term "Jehovah"; the King James Version had employed this in four places, but everywhere else, except in three cases where it was employed as part of a proper name, used the English word "LORD" (or in certain cases "GOD") printed in capitals. The present revision returns to the procedure of the King James Version, which follows the precedent of the ancient Greek and Latin translators and the long-established practice in the reading of the Hebrew scriptures in the synagogue. While it is almost if not quite certain that the Name was originally pronounced "Yahweh," this pronunciation was not indicated when the Masoretes added vowel signs to the consonantal Hebrew text. To the four consonants YHWH of the Name, which had come to be regarded as too sacred to be pronounced, they attached vowel-signs indicating that in its place the Hebrew word *Adonai* meaning "Lord" (or *Elohim* meaning "God") should be read. The ancient Greek translators substituted the word *Kyrios* (Lord) for the Name. The Vulgate likewise used the Latin word *Dominus*. The form "Jehovah" is of late mediæval origin; it is a combination of the consonants of the Divine Name and the vowels attached to it by the Masoretes but belonging to an entirely different word. The sound of Y is represented by J and the sound of W by V, as in Latin. For two reasons the Committee has returned to the more familiar usage of the King James Version: (1) the word "Jehovah" does not accurately represent any form of the Name ever used in Hebrew; and (2) the use of any proper name for the one and only God, as though there were other gods from whom he had to be distinguished, was discontinued in Judaism before the Christian era and is entirely inappropriate for the universal faith of the Christian Church.

The King James Version of the New

Testament was based upon a Greek text that was marred by mistakes, containing the accumulated errors of fourteen centuries of manuscript copying. It was essentially the Greek text of the New Testament as edited by Beza, 1589, who closely followed that published by Erasmus, 1516-1535, which was based upon a few mediaeval manuscripts. The earliest and best of the eight manuscripts which Erasmus consulted was from the tenth century, and he made the least use of it because it differed most from the commonly received text; Beza had access to two manuscripts of great value, dating from the fifth and sixth centuries, but he made very little use of them because they differed from the text published by Erasmus.

We now possess many more ancient manuscripts of the New Testament, and are far better equipped to seek to recover the original wording of the Greek text. The evidence for the text of the books of the New Testament is better than for any other ancient book, both in the number of extant manuscripts and in the nearness of the date of some of these manuscripts to the date when the book was originally written.

The revisers in the 1870's had most of the evidence that we now have for the Greek text, though the most ancient of all extant manuscripts of the Greek New Testament were not discovered until 1931. But they lacked the resources which discoveries within the past eighty years have afforded for understanding the vocabulary, grammar and idioms of the Greek New Testament. An amazing body of Greek papyri has been unearthed in Egypt since the 1870's—private letters, official reports, wills, business accounts, petitions, and other such trivial, everyday recordings of the ongoing activities of human beings. In 1895 appeared the first of Adolf Deissmann's studies of these ordinary materials. He proved that many words which had hitherto been assumed to belong to what was called "Biblical Greek" were current in the spoken vernacular of the first century A.D. The New Testament was written in the Koine, the common Greek which was spoken and understood practically everywhere throughout the Roman Empire

in the early centuries of the Christian era. This development in the study of New Testament Greek has come since the work on the English Revised Version and the American Standard Version was done, and at many points sheds new light upon the meaning of the Greek text.

The Revised Standard Version of the New Testament was published on February 11, 1946, and has met with wide acceptance. The present republication has afforded the Committee opportunity to review its work and to consider criticisms and suggestions from various readers. As a result, about eighty changes are made in the present edition. Most of these are in the interest of the identical rendering of identical Greek in parallel passages, especially in the synoptic gospels; or in the interest of consistency in handling the textual evidence. The words "sanctify" and "sanctification" have been restored in some passages, to preclude mistaken inferences that had been drawn from their replacement by "consecrate" and "consecration," and to agree with our retention of the term "sanctify" in the Old Testament. Some additional notes offer alternative readings; and in some cases a word or phrase is changed in the interest of greater clarity or felicity. Examples of such changes are in Luke 24:28; John 8:53; 11:50; 17:2; Acts 17:28; 1 Corinthians 4:5; Philippians 1:7; 2 Timothy 3:8; 1 John 3:10.

A major reason for revision of the King James Version, which is valid for both the Old Testament and the New Testament, is the change since 1611 in English usage. Many forms of expression have become archaic, while still generally intelligible—the use of thou, thee, thy, thine and the verb endings -est and -odst, the verb endings -eth and -th, it came to pass that, whosoever, whatsoever, insomuch that, because that, for that, unto, howbeit, peradventure, holden, aforesome, and must needs, would fain, be-hoooved, to you-ward, etc. Other words are obsolete and no longer understood by the common reader. The greatest problem, however, is presented by the English words which are still in constant use but now convey a different meaning from that which

they had in 1611 and in the King James Version. These words were once accurate translations of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures; but now, having changed in meaning, they have become misleading. They no longer say what the King James translators meant them to say.

The King James Version uses the word "let" in the sense of "hinder," "prevent" to mean "precede," "allow" in the sense of "approve," "communicate" for "share," "conversation" for "conduct," "comprehend" for "overcome," "ghost" for "spirit," "wealth for "well-being," "allege" for "prove," "demand" for "ask," "take no thought" for "be not anxious," "purchase a good degree" for "gain a good standing," etc. The Greek word for "immediately" is translated in the King James Version not only by "immediately" and "straightway" but also by the terms "anon," "by and by" and "presently." There are more than three hundred such English words which are used in the King James Version in a sense substantially different from that which they now convey. It not only does the King James translators no honor, but it is quite unfair to them and to the truth which they understood and expressed, to retain these words which now convey meanings they did not intend.

This preface does not undertake to set forth in detail the lines along which the revision has proceeded. That was done for the New Testament in 1946, in a pamphlet entitled *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament*, written by the members of the New Testament Section. It is done for the Old Testament in a similar pamphlet, *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the Old Testament*, written by members of the Old Testament Section. Both pamphlets are designed to help the general public to understand the main principles which have guided this comprehensive revision of the King James and American Standard Versions.

All the reasons which led to the demand for revision of the King James Version in the nineteenth century are still valid, and are even more cogent now than then. We

have had a freer charter than our predecessors in the 1870's in that we have not been required, as they were, to limit the language of the English Bible to the vocabulary of the Elizabethan age. But we hope that we have not taken undue advantage of that freedom. The Revised Standard Version is not a new translation in the language of today. It is not a paraphrase which aims at striking idioms. It is a revision which seeks to preserve all that is best in the English Bible as it has been known and used through the years. It is intended for use in public and private worship, not merely for reading and instruction. We have resisted the temptation to use phrases that are merely current usage, and have sought to put the message of the Bible in simple, enduring words that are worthy to stand in the great Tyndale-King James tradition. We are glad to say, with the King James translators: "Truly (good Christian Reader) we never thought from the beginning, that we should need to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one . . . but to make a good one better."

The Bible is more than an historical document to be preserved. And it is more than a classic of English literature to be cherished and admired. It is a record of God's dealing with men, of God's revelation of Himself and His will. It records the life and work of Him in whom the Word of God became flesh and dwelt among men. The Bible carries its full message, not to those who regard it simply as a heritage of the past or praise its literary style, but to those who read it that they may discern and understand God's Word to men. That Word must not be disguised in phrases that are no longer clear, or hidden under words that have changed or lost their meaning. It must stand forth in language that is direct and plain and meaningful to people today. It is our hope and our earnest prayer that this Revised Standard Version of the Bible may be used by God to speak to men in these momentous times, and to help them to understand and believe and obey His Word.

II

The Use of the Versions IN THE REVISED STANDARD VERSION

FLEMING JAMES

Dean Emeritus, School of Theology, University of the South; Executive Secretary, Old Testament Section of the Standard Bible Committee

WITH THE exception of the recently discovered Dead Sea Scrolls of Isaiah and Habakkuk, and some fragments of other books, the earliest Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament date from about 1000 A.D., many centuries after the books were written. This fact of itself makes it difficult to determine the original text. But an additional difficulty is presented by the further fact that there are few variants, because the manuscripts all belong to one family, going back to a single manuscript of the early Christian era. Then, too, the present Hebrew text (the Masoretic Text) was laboriously fixed by Jewish scholars called the Masoretes (tradition men) in the sixth or seventh centuries A.D.

Happily, however, we have indirect access to Hebrew texts independent of the Masoretic Text, and dating from a much earlier time. This access is chiefly through the four ancient Versions. Of these a few words must be written.

Since the Old Testament was written in Hebrew, except for two minor passages and a single verse in Aramaic, the need for a translation into Greek was early felt, that the Greek-speaking Jews of the Dispersion, many of whom did not know Hebrew, might have their Bible in their own language, and that interested Gentiles might read the Jewish scriptures for themselves. In response to this need a translation of the Old Testament into Greek was made in Alexandria, beginning about 250 B.C. with the Law and concluding about 100 B.C. with the Writings. This, the first of the great ancient Versions, was commonly called the Septuagint, possibly because legend attributed it to seventy translators.

Some 200 years after Christ a Jewish trans-

lation into Aramaic was put forth, called the Targum (translation). About the same time Syriac-speaking Christians made a translation of both Testaments into Syriac, called the Peshitta (simple). Last of all, about 400 A.D., a foremost Christian scholar, Hieronymus (St. Jerome), brought forth a translation of both Testaments into Latin called the Vulgate (spread abroad).

These four Versions are on the whole extant. Besides them we have fragments of other ancient translations: those of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus into Greek, and the "Old Latin" antedating the Vulgate. Supplementing these translations is the so-called Samaritan Pentateuch, preserved by the Samaritans who broke off from Judaism in the fourth century B.C., taking with them the first five books of the Hebrew Bible as their own scriptures.

These ancient Versions, of course, were made from Hebrew manuscripts available in their day, and so reflect Hebrew texts independent of our present Hebrew text. In general they agree with it fairly closely, but there are still innumerable places where one or more of them presents a different reading. Where this occurs the revisers have usually retained the Hebrew reading. At times, however, the Hebrew reading has seemed unsatisfactory because of its obscurity or its unsuitability in the context, while the Versional reading has seemed superior. In these cases the revisers have incorporated the Versional reading in the text, calling attention in a note to this fact and giving where possible a translation of the displaced Hebrew reading. They have used the Versions in this way more extensively than their predecessors of the ASV and thereby, they hope, have enriched the RSV.

Perhaps the best way to describe the use of the ancient Versions in the RSV is to give some concrete illustrations. This will be in large measure to anticipate what the reader can learn for himself from the text and notes of the new Version. But it may be of help to him to assemble from its many hundreds of pages a number of instances in which the revisers have displaced the Hebrew by a Versional reading. These are set down in the order of the biblical books, no attempt being made to classify them. If any reader desires classification it is better for him to make one which corresponds to his particular need. In each case the ASV rendering of the Hebrew text will be given, followed by the RSV rendering of the Versional reading, with the Version, or Versions, exhibiting it.

In the story of Abel's murder the Hebrew, after describing Cain's temptation to kill Abel, has: "And Cain told Abel his brother" (Gen. 4.8), which makes no sense. The ASV explains in the margin: "Heb. *said unto*," which does not help. The RSV, following the Greek, Syriac, and Vulgate, reads: "Cain said to Abel his brother, 'Let us go out to the field,'" thus introducing the account of the crime.

In Gen. 21.9 the Hebrew tells how at the feast celebrating Isaac's weaning Sarah saw Hagar's son "mocking," and in her anger turned to Abraham with the demand that Hagar and her son be cast out. This puts Ishmael in an offensive light. The ASV mitigates the offensiveness by a marginal note: "Or, *playing*." The RSV, with the Greek and Vulgate, says that Sarah saw Ishmael "playing with her son Isaac," which is a pleasant picture, making Sarah's conduct less excusable.

In the account of the Red Sea passage the ASV says that the pillar of cloud came between the two camps, adding: "and there was the cloud and the darkness, yet it gave light by night" (Ex. 14.20). One might well ask, How could it give darkness and light at the same time? The King James Version answered by inserting four words: "it was a cloud and darkness *to them*, but it gave light by night *to these*." The RSV renders with

the Greek: "and the night passed without one coming near the other all night."

Another mention of the cloud occasions another use of the Versions. In Num. 9.16 the Hebrew reads: "the cloud covered it (the tabernacle), and the appearance of fire by night." The Greek, Syriac, and Vulgate have: "the cloud covered it by day, and the appearance of fire by night"; and the RSV has adopted this reading.

Three examples are found in the story of the Levite and his concubine. The Hebrew describes the action of the girl by a harsh term: "his concubine played the harlot against him and went away from him to her father's house" (Judg. 19.2). The Greek Codex Alexandrinus and the Old Latin read: "his concubine became angry with him"; which need not be to her discredit, in view of the Levite's character as revealed by the narrative. Again, in 19.3, the Hebrew says that on his arrival "she brought him into her father's house," which seems strange, seeing she was not with him. Here the same Greek codex reads: "he came to her father's house." Finally, in 19.18, the Hebrew has him say to the hospitable Ephraimite in Gibeah: "I am going to the house of Jehovah," which does not fit in with the story. The Greek, reinforced by Judg. 19.9, gives what seems a more correct reading: "I am going to my home." The RSV has put these three Versional readings into the text.

In describing Elkanah's treatment of his favorite wife at the annual family sacrificial feast, the ASV renders the obscure Hebrew: "but unto Hannah he gave a double portion; for he loved Hannah, but Jehovah had shut up her womb" (1 Sam. 1.5). The RSV, following the Greek, gives a somewhat different picture: "and, although he loved Hannah, he would give Hannah only one portion, because the LORD had closed her womb."

1 Sam. 14.41 is a well known instance of the divergence of the Hebrew from the Versions. When after his victory over the Philistines Saul could get no answer from the LORD, he appealed to the sacred lot to determine who had been guilty of offending the LORD. Putting the people on this side

and himself and Jonathan on that he asked the LORD to indicate one or the other. Here the Hebrew reads: "Therefore Saul said unto Jehovah, the God of Israel, 'Show the right'" (ASV margin: "Or, *Give a perfect lot*."). The Greek and the Vulgate, however, make the transaction much plainer. Combining the two the RSV reads: "Therefore Saul said, 'O LORD God of Israel, why hast thou not answered thy servant this day? If this guilt is in me or in Jonathan my son, O LORD, give Urim; but if this guilt is in thy people Israel, give Thummim.'"

When Absalom had occupied Jerusalem after David's flight, Ahitophel proposed immediate pursuit of the fugitives, giving an assurance which the ASV thus renders from the Hebrew: "I will smite the king only; and I will bring back all the people unto thee: the man whom thou seekest is as if all returned: so all the people shall be in peace" (2 Sam. 17.2-3). The RSV, following the Greek, renders: "I will strike down the king only, and bring all the people back to you as a bride comes home to her husband. You seek the life of only one man, and all the people will be at peace." In this case the Hebrew is awkward and not altogether clear, while the Greek is direct and has a character of its own.

Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple begins thus in the Hebrew: "Then spake Solomon, 'Jehovah hath said that he would dwell in the thick darkness.'" Here the revisers have put in the text the Lucianic recension of the Greek:

"The Lord has set the sun in the heavens, but has said that he would dwell in thick darkness." (1 Kings 8.12).

This is one of the best examples of the enrichment of the Hebrew text by a Versional addition.

In 2 Chron. 25.8 the revisers have adopted a Greek reading which contradicts the Hebrew. Amaziah king of Judah had hired a hundred thousand warriors of Israel to help him against the Edomites. As he was setting out with them and his Judahite troops a man of God met him with the message: "Do not let the army of Israel go with you, for the LORD is not with Israel, with all these Ephraimites." Then, according to the He-

brew, he added: "But if thou wilt go, do valiantly, be strong for the battle: God will cast thee down before the enemy . . ." Unless this is irony it involves a contradiction. The Greek is more consistent with the context: "But if you suppose that in this way you will be strong for war, God will cast you down before the enemy."

Passing now to the poetic books, the Hebrew in Job 32.9 seems to miss the point when it makes Elihu say: "It is not the great that are wise," for Elihu is repudiating the claim of the others that just because they are *old* they are wise. The RSV rightly adopts the reading of the Greek and Syriac: "It is not the old (i.e., the great in days, as the Syriac puts it) that are wise."

The RSV also makes an improvement in Job 37.7, where the Hebrew reads:

"He sealeth up the hand of every man
that all men whom he hath made may
know it."

More satisfactory is the reading of the Vulgate, which the RSV adopts:

" . . . that all men may know his work."

In Ps. 22.21, according to the Hebrew, the suffering psalmist exclaims:

"Save me from the lion's mouth;
yea, from the horns of the wild-oxen
thou hast answered me."

The last line gives a very abrupt transition from the agonized cries for help that he has just been uttering. It is possible, of course, that the transition is intentional, and that the psalmist has just experienced a sudden breaking in of confidence that God has already heard his appeal. But the Greek and Syriac make such a violent transition unnecessary:

"Save me from the mouth of the lion,
my lowliness from the horns of the
wild oxen."

The RSV, in adopting the reading, renders lowliness by "afflicted soul."

Ps. 49.11 gives another illustration of the happy use of the Versions. The psalmist is reflecting on the fact that the wise and the foolish alike perish and leave their wealth to others. According to the ASV he proceeds:

"Their inward thought is, that their houses shall continue forever," which is not a very convincing rendering of

the obscure Hebrew. The RSV has adopted from the Greek and Syriac:

"Their graves are their homes for ever," thus turning the mind of the reader to the poignant finality of death rather than to man's comfortable illusion of continuance.

The writer of Ps. 69 is praying for defense against his enemies and for their punishment. In verse 26 the Hebrew has him say:

"For they persecute him thou hast smitten and they tell of the sorrow (or pain) of those whom thou hast wounded."

The revisers have adopted from the Greek and Syriac a more forceful second line:

"and him whom thou hast wounded, they afflict still more."

Ps. 85.8 is rendered from the Hebrew by the ASV:

"For he will speak peace to his people, and to his saints: but let them not turn again to folly."

The abrupt warning strikes a jarring note in the divine assurance to a people who need above all else to be comforted. The RSV, following the Greek, gives a more likely second line:

"to his saints, to those who turn to him in their hearts."

The writer of Ps. 97, in picturing the joyful reign of God, utters a beautiful promise. In the Hebrew it reads:

"Light is sown for the righteous" (verse 11).

But the figure is rather forced. The Greek, the Syriac, and Jerome, however, had in their Hebrew text a verb that closely resembles "is sown,"

"Light dawns for the righteous," and the revisers have adopted this Versional reading.

Ps. 109 is crowded with imprecations against the psalmist's enemies, but he declares that until now he has shown them love:

"For my love they are my adversaries: but I give myself unto prayer." (Ps. 109.4).

In thus rendering the Hebrew the ASV is compelled to insert three words which are not in the original; for what the Hebrew says

is, "but I prayer." The RSV follows the Syriac:

"even as I make my prayer for them."

Thus a nobler note is introduced, if only for a moment, into this psalm of curses.

Several instances of the use of the Versions in the Book of Proverbs may be noted:

Prov. 10.10:

ASV: "He that winketh with eye causeth sorrow,

but a prating fool shall fall."

RSV, Greek: "He who winks with the eye causes trouble, but he who boldly reproves makes peace."

Prov. 14.17:

ASV: "He that is soon angry will deal foolishly;

and a man of wicked devices is hated."

RSV, Greek: "A man of quick temper acts foolishly, but a man of discretion is patient."

Prov. 24.21:

ASV: "My son, fear thou Jehovah and the king;

and company not with them that are given to change."

RSV, Greek: "My son, fear the LORD and the king, and do not disobey either of them."

We conclude with four examples from the prophetic books. In Is. 49.24 the prophet puts a rhetorical question which reads in the Hebrew: "Shall the prey be taken from the mighty, or the lawful captives be delivered?" He is expressing the incredulity of his hearers, who do not see how the Israelites can be rescued from so powerful a master as Babylon; but the second clause makes little sense, for they are hardly "lawful captives." One ancient Hebrew manuscript, the Syriac, and the Vulgate resolve the difficulty, and the RSV accepts their reading:

"or the captives of a tyrant be rescued?"

Jer. 23.33 has a play on the word "burden," which was a common term for an oracle laid upon the prophet to utter. In the Hebrew text the play is obscured: "And when

this people, or a prophet, or a priest, shall ask thee, saying, 'What is the burden of Jehovah?' then thou shalt say unto them, 'What burden? I will cast you off, saith Jehovah.' The RSV adopts the reading of the Greek and the Vulgate: "... You shall say to them, 'You are the burden, and I will cast you off, says the LORD.'

In the beautiful Shepherd Chapter of Ezekiel the Hebrew introduces a discordant note into one of its loving assurances: "I will seek that which was lost, and will bring back that which was driven away, and will bind up that which was broken, and will strengthen that which was sick; but the fat and the strong I will destroy" (Ezek. 34.16). The Greek, Syriac, and Vulgate read a Hebrew word which differs very slightly from "destroy," and portrays a loving attitude of the shepherd to the healthy sheep: "but the fat and the strong I will watch over." The RSV has adopted this Versional reading.

In Hos. 14.2 the prophet pleads with Israel to confess its guilt to God: "Take with you words, and return unto Jehovah: say unto him, Take away all iniquity, and accept that which is good: so will we render *as* bullocks the offering of our lips." Here, as the italics show, the Hebrew has "render bullocks our lips." Its meaning is plain, but the metaphor is strained. The Greek and the Syriac, on the other hand, read:

"and we will render
the fruit of our lips,"

and the revisers have preferred this.

These illustrations will give some idea of the way in which the revisers have introduced into the RSV readings from the ancient Versions. It is hoped that such changes may be found helpful. But the reader is always informed by a note when one has been made, and if he prefers the Hebrew text he can get it from the same note and from the ASV.

TEN MILLION AMBASSADORS

You can help to feed and clothe the needy people in Europe and Asia by sending a CARE package. You can pick the recipient or CARE will pick one for you. Send your ten dollars to CARE, New York or your local CARE headquarters.



SEND ANOTHER
CARE PACKAGE
OVERSEAS TODAY!

III

The Use of the Versions IN TRANSLATING THE HOLY SCRIPTURES

HARRY M. ORLINSKY

Professor of Bible, Hebrew Union College—Jewish Institute of Religion, New York City

A.

1. The Jews were themselves the first to recognize the importance of making their Holy Scriptures, the Hebrew Bible, available in translation for those who could not understand the original. During the third century B.C. the Jewish community in Alexandria, Egypt, had grown to such proportions in population, and had begun to give up Hebrew in favor of the Greek vernacular to such an extent, that a translation into Greek of the Five Books of Moses, the most authoritative part of what then constituted the Holy Writings, became necessary. This was accomplished in a Greek version which came to be known popularly as the Septuagint (Latin for "Seventy"), in accordance with the story told by a certain Aristaeus to his brother Philocrates (the so-called "Letter of Aristaeus")¹ that such a translation was made by "Seventy-two elders" (six from each of the twelve tribes of Israel). Translation into Greek of the other two divisions of the Hebrew Bible, namely, the Prophets and the Hagiographa, took place during the second and first centuries B.C.

2. In Western Asia, especially Babylonia and Judea, on the other hand, Aramaic was a popular vernacular among the Jews; so much so, as a matter of fact, that the original Aramaic text of the book of Daniel was turned also into the "Holy Tongue," Hebrew, before the Book could be incorporated as Holy Writ. The early history and the precise relationship of the Aramaic translations of the Pentateuch and of the Prophets and Hagiographa are obscure. However by the second century A.D. there were in public use the Targum Onkelos on the Pentateuch, the Jerusalem Targum (so-called Targum Jonathan) on every Book in the Bible except Daniel, and

other Aramaic translations now known to us only in fragmentary form.²

3. Early in the second century A.D. a convert to Judaism, Aquila, made a fresh and unique Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible. He incorporated the sort of Jewish exegesis which was current in his day, and he avoided the Christological elements which had been introduced into the Septuagint. Thus Aquila rendered the Hebrew word *ba-alma* in Isa. 7:14 literally, "the young woman, girl," in place of the term "the virgin" which the Christians had substituted for it. Unfortunately, only fragments of Aquila's version have been preserved.³

4. During the latter part of the second century there was still another translation made from the Hebrew text of the Bible, the Syriac, called popularly the Peshitta. Whether this version too was made by and for the Jews, to be later worked over by Christians, or whether it was made originally by a (Judeo-) Christian group and came under the influence of Jewish exegesis, can no longer be determined. This version reflects influence on the part of the Septuagint.⁴

5. By the fourth century much of the Christian world had come to employ Latin as its vernacular. Jerome set to work turning the Hebrew Bible (*hebraica veritas* "the Hebrew truth" he called it) into this language. Thus the Vulgate came into being.⁵

These translations, the Septuagint, Targumim, Aquila, Peshitta and Vulgate, constitute the five ancient primary versions which are basic for the understanding of the Hebrew Bible. And all five, moreover, are Jewish in origin; that is to say, Jewish scholars participated in the making of four of the five versions, and Jewish exegesis and teachers (as well as the Septuagint and Aquila) influenced Jerome to a very considerable extent in the making of the fifth.⁶

¹All footnotes at the end of article.

B.

6. Numerous translations were made directly from or under the strong influence of these primary versions. By the second century the Septuagint had been translated into Latin by the Christians of North Africa and Italy to whom this language was understood. This secondary version is known as the Old Latin. During the same century several Greek revisions were made of all or of parts of the Septuagint. Theodotion tended to turn the frequently Hebraized syntax of the Septuagint into more idiomatic Greek, at the same time following closely the Hebrew text current in his time whenever the Septuagint differed from it. Symmachus was inclined to paraphrase Aquila in his revision of the Septuagint. Other translators, now known only by the number of the Greek column which they occupied in the Hexapla, the many (usually six)-columned Bible compiled by Origen in the third century, were Quinta, Sexta and Septima.

7. From the third to the tenth centuries the Septuagint was turned by Christians of various lands into such languages as Coptic (in Egypt; especially the Sahidic and Bohairic dialects), Areminian, Georgian, Gothic, Ethiopic, Arabic and Slavonic. During the third century Origen made a careful revision of the Septuagint text to accord with the Hebrew text of his time. This revision was turned into Armenian and Syriac, the latter now known (after Origen's Hexapla) as the Syro-Hexapla.

8. There remain two primary versions of the Hebrew Bible to be mentioned. Sometime during the period between about the fifth and third century B.C. the Samaritan Jews broke away from the general Jewish community in Judea. Their Holy Scriptures consisted of the Pentateuch alone, and it is written in the Samaritan script. In the tenth century Saadia in Babylonia turned the Hebrew Bible into Judeo-Arabic (Arabic written in Hebrew characters).⁷

C.

9. To an overwhelming extent, the text of the Hebrew Bible has been transmitted faithfully and accurately, and its meaning is

generally clear. Nevertheless there are numerous enough words and even passages, more in the Prophets and Hagiographa than in the Pentateuch, which defy understanding, and where sometimes the text itself may no longer be original, that is, the text may have become corrupted.

Far and away the best of all the primary versions for the understanding or amending of the Hebrew text is the Septuagint. For one thing, it is the oldest of the versions, and thus it presumably derived from older Hebrew texts than the other versions. Secondly, and more important, it is known that from about the first century A.D., during the last years of the Second Jewish Commonwealth, the Hebrew text became more or less fixed. This is amply clear from a study of such primary versions as the Targumim, Aquila and the Vulgate, and from the revisions of the Septuagint made by Theodotion, Symmachus and Origen to accord with the Hebrew text current in their day. On the other hand, the Septuagint in pre-Christian days derived from a Hebrew text which differed in many respects from that which became more or less fixed after the destruction of Judea in 70.

10. It so happens that the oldest dated manuscript of the Masoretic text of the Hebrew Bible is not older than the early tenth century.⁸ This text is the product of Masoretes, Jewish scholars who labored devotedly during the first millennium to transmit the Holy Scriptures in the form in which they received them. The Septuagint translation, on the other hand, is represented by one manuscript of the second century and several of the fourth and fifth centuries; some bits of fragments go back to the second century B.C. Overwhelmingly the Hebrew text preserved by the Masoretes agrees with that underlying the Septuagint, or is superior to it when the two do not agree. The use of the Septuagint comes into play when its Hebrew text (*Vorlage*) differs from the Masoretic text and there is uncertainty as to which of the two represents the original reading. This is where the competent textual critic of the Hebrew Bible can show his mettle.

11. There are two problems involved in

the use of the Septuagint for the clarification or emendation of the Hebrew Bible. Firstly, there is the problem of how to recover the original text of the Septuagint.

(a) It is not unlikely that even before the Septuagint translation came into being, some individual attempts were made by Alexandrian Jews at translating parts of the Pentateuch into Greek. This was done in the same spirit that several English translations of parts of the Bible were made by Christians in England before the so-called King James version was done, and by Jews in England and America prior to the version achieved by the Jewish Publication Society of America in 1917. However, all traces of these assumed pre-Septuagint translations have disappeared, leaving only the Septuagint itself.

(b) The original Septuagint manuscript, too, has not been preserved. It may have perished during one of the anti-Jewish pogroms which occurred in Egypt under Roman domination, or when the great library in Alexandria burned down. In our own times, pending a census of what was destroyed in Europe during World War II, there are in existence some twelve manuscripts containing the Septuagint of the entire Old Testament, and several hundred containing individual divisions (the Pentateuch), or groups of Books (the Minor Prophets; the Major Prophets; the Five Scrolls), or individual Books, or fragments of parts of single Books. Most of the manuscripts are to be found in Italy, Great Britain and Ireland, France, Russia and Germany.

(c) Furthermore, there are available for study today scores of manuscripts of the Old Latin, Coptic, Armenian, Georgian, Gothic, Ethiopic, Arabic and Slavonic translations of the Septuagint, which help to determine the text of the Septuagint manuscripts from which they were translated. Finally, the Septuagint was used by such ancient Jewish writers as Philo and Josephus (first century) and by such early Christian scholars and Fathers as Justin, Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, Cyril and Theodoret. Their citations from the Septuagint are valuable witnesses to the readings of their Greek texts.

12. The task of the textual critic is to determine which manuscript, or group of manuscripts, has preserved the original, or the nearest to the original text of the Septuagint. From this text he attempts to reconstruct the Hebrew text from which it derived, and he then compares the two Hebrew texts, the one derived from the Septuagint and the one which has been preserved (the Masoretic), to determine which of the two is the original where they differ from each other. This task is obviously a monumental one, requiring a more than common amount of erudition, sober judgment and patience. It has been accomplished so far by one scholar dealing with one Book, Max Leopold Margolis in *The Book of Joshua in Greek*. It is worth describing, if only briefly, how this extraordinarily learned biblical philologist went about this exceedingly complex task.

13. Margolis first obtained photostatic copies, wherever possible, of all manuscripts of all the primary and secondary versions. He then proceeded to compare the secondary versions of the Septuagint with the many Greek manuscripts representing the Septuagint. He compared the Greek manuscripts with each other and with the citations from these manuscripts in the writings of the Church Fathers. He chose Joshua of all the Books in the Bible because it lent itself admirably to textual and exegetical analysis and, what is of supreme importance, because it contained hundreds of proper names the history of which, in context, could readily be traced. He found that all this material could be distributed among four major groups (called recensions) and one mixed group, which arose during the first few centuries A.D. in Egypt (especially Alexandria), Syria, (especially Antioch), Palestine (especially the work of Origen in Bethlehem), and Asia Minor (especially Constantinople). In his monumental work (all in autograph!) Margolis provided at the top of the page "the nearest approach to the Greek original as it left the hands of the translator(s)" of Joshua. Below the text he made available the pertinent data of the chief recensions. And lastly, at the bottom of the page, there were brief notes bearing on the Septuagint in relation to

the Masoretic Hebrew text.⁹ What Margolis achieved for Joshua has been done in part by James A. Montgomery on Daniel and Kings, by Joseph Ziegler on Isaiah and the Minor Prophets, and by Alfred Rahlfs on Ruth, Genesis and Psalms.

14. The second problem which the textual critic must resolve is how to handle the Septuagint text, and the other primary versions, in relation to the Masoretic text. One difficulty in the past has been the failure to bear in mind the fact that the Septuagint, as all the other primary versions either directly or indirectly, is a Jewish work, with the result that an enormous amount of time and effort has been wasted in its unscientific use for the "elucidation" and "restoration" of the Masoretic text. The Hebrew Bible was read, studied and interpreted (and re-interpreted) by the Jews during the Maccabean, Mishnic and Talmudic periods no less than it was before the second century B.C. and after the sixth century A.D. It is only reasonable to assume that where the Septuagint and the other versions point, or appear to point to a Hebrew reading which differs from that preserved in the Masoretic text, there may be involved not two variants of which only one can be original, but one reading of which the versions are simply an interpretation. And parallels to this interpretation should be sought in the vast literature which the Jews produced from the second century B.C. through the sixth century A.D. (the Targumim, Mishnah, Tosefta, Midrashim and Gemara), a literature which is a mine of information for the discerning scholar.¹⁰

D.

15. The Hebrew Bible was to the Jews a collection of sacred books. The Bible was translated into Greek precisely because the Sacred Scriptures had to be made accessible to those Jews who no longer knew enough Hebrew to read the original. The Aramaic Targumim, Saadia's Arabic translation, and the modern (1917) English version sponsored by the Jewish Publication Society were made for the same reason. Is it reasonable to suppose that these same Jews willfully or negligently altered and corrupted their Hebrew Bible between the third century B.C.

(when the Septuagint began to appear) and the second century A.D. (when the other primary versions began to appear) to the extent that the thousands of footnotes in the second and third editions of the most widely used critical edition today, R. Kittle's *Biblia Hebraica*, would indicate?¹¹ The Septuagint, Targum and Peshitta, not to speak of the daughter versions, have all too frequently been abused so as to create from them a Hebrew text which never existed outside of the imagination of scholars.

16. In trying to determine the Hebrew text from which the Septuagint and other versions were made, the student must make a careful analysis of the character of these translations of the entire Book of which his troublesome reading is a part. Only after he has learned to know and to "feel" the stylistic, lexical, exegetical and theological characteristics of the translators, is he ready to tackle the Hebrew aspect of his problem.¹² If the student finds it impossible to explain the reading in any of the versions in the light of the reading preserved in the Masoretic text, then he must try to find a solution which at one and the same time explains both the reading in the versions and that in the Masoretic text. Unless proposed emendation based upon the versions satisfies these requirements, it may well exhibit nothing more than the ingenuity of the critic.¹³

17. Let us take up a few cases in point. The Masoretic text of Isa. 32:6 may be rendered literally, ("For the vile person will speak villainy, and his heart) will do (iniquity . . ."). However, since the heart (unlike the person himself, or his hands, etc.) does not "do" iniquity, and since both the Septuagint and the Targum read "and his heart will consider (or, plan, devise) iniquity," scholars generally emended the Masoretic reading *ya'a'eb* ("will do") to *yabashob* ("will consider"). This emendation became "clinched," as it were, when the St. Mark's Scroll of Isaiah was found to read a form of the same root, namely, *hosheb*. However, one fundamental matter had been overlooked. The critics had forgotten to consult the rest of the book of Isaiah to determine how the Septuagint and Targum rendered

expressions of this kind, and especially how the verbal forms of the root *basbab* were reproduced in these versions. A careful study of all twelve occurrences of this root in Isaiah proved beyond all doubt that the Septuagint and Targum did not read a form of *basbab* in our passage; they merely rendered freely (and correctly!) in accordance with the context. And so far as the reading in the St. Mark's scroll is concerned, it only helped a considerable body of other evidence to prove that this scroll was ultimately only an utterly unreliable oral variation on the theme of the Hebrew text of Isaiah. It has no value for the textual criticism of our Book.¹⁴

18. Kittel's footnote on our word should be a warning on how not to use the secondary versions for the criticism of the Hebrew text. He notes (*Biblia Hebraica*, 3rd ed.) that the Septuagint, Old Latin and Targum read *yabashob* ("will consider") in place of Masoretic *y'daseb* ("will do."). Actually, of course, the Old Latin does not prove anything at all for the Hebrew text. It can point only to the reading of the Septuagint text whence it derived.¹⁵

19. In Job 8:16 the Masoretic text reads "(and over) his garden (his shoots go forth)," but the Septuagint text reads "his corruption." Accordingly Beer, in his textual study of Job, explained the reading of the Septuagint as due to a reading *rimmah* in place of *gannah* in the Hebrew text. Other scholars (e.g., Hatch-Redpath, Dhorme), more discreetly, simply recognized the problem of being unable to account for the Septuagint reading, and let it go at that. Actually the Septuagint had the same reading in its Hebrew text as the Masoretes preserved. What happened is that the original reading in the Septuagint suffered corruption, so that an original *prasia* "garden-plot" (for the Hebrew *gannah*) became the preserved erroneous *sapria* "corruption." Again, in Josh. 2:1 virtually all the textual witnesses agree on the Septuagint rendering of the Hebrew word *way-yishebu*, namely, *kai katelusan* "and they lodged." Five cursive manuscripts of the Septuagint stand all alone in their rendering *kai katepausan* "and they rested." Unable to account for the latter reading, Margolis (p. 16

of his Greek *Joshua*) had to content himself with the statement, "The variant *katepausan* of unknown provenance . . ." However it seems likely enough that we are faced here with nothing more than an inner-septuagintal corruption in the uncial script whereby original *Katelusan* was corrupted accidentally (*via L/A*) into *Kateausan* to become *Katepausan*.¹⁶

20. On the other hand, in Job 5:8 the Septuagint is one of four arguments in favor of emending Masoretic *'el* "God" to *shaddai* "the Almighty." In Num. 24:9 the Samaritan and the Septuagint help to prove that the original reading was not the Masoretic *shakab* "to lie down" (used for human beings) but *rabas* "to lie down, crouch" (used for animals). And in II Sam. 6:20 it would seem that the Septuagint reading "dancers" helps to prove that the Masoretic reading *reqim* "empty" should be emended to *roqdim* "dancers."¹⁷

21. The versions, furthermore, and especially the Septuagint and the Targumim, can be of considerable assistance to the student of Biblical Hebrew grammar, who will consequently understand the text so much the better. Thus a careful analysis of the Septuagint and the Targum helps to prove the existence and clarify the character of the verbal noun in Biblical Hebrew.¹⁸ The cognate languages are a primary source for the semantic history of Biblical Hebrew. However the Septuagint and Targum constitute a source no less primary, and they should be used in conjunction with them. Thus together with the Peshitta and Vulgate, the Septuagint and Targum help to disprove some of the meanings attributed in Brown-Driver-Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, to the root *tapas* "lay hold of."¹⁹

22. The average biblical commentary of three or four decades ago was filled with a wealth of changes of the Hebrew text which were believed to be indicated and even demanded by the Septuagint and the other versions. To a considerable extent the thousands of suggested readings and emendations in the critical apparatus of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* are still the product of that period. It

was an era when the Bible was discounted considerably as a reliable source for the reconstruction of history, and when the authenticity of the Hebrew text of the Bible was held in no higher regard. We are nowadays very much less inclined to be sceptical of something biblical merely because extra-biblical data supporting it are lacking. Until demonstrated otherwise, the benefit of the doubt must be entered on the credit side of the biblical ledger. The same attitude is now being taken increasingly toward the reliability of the text of the Hebrew Bible in relation to the Septuagint and the other versions.

FOOTNOTES

¹See now the splendid edition (Introduction, Greek text, English translation and commentary) by Moses Hadas, *Aristeas to Philocrates* (1951), in the Dropsie College series *Jewish Apocryphal Literature*. While Hadas is inclined toward 130 B.C. as the approximate date of this document, the present writer is inclined toward a date nearer to 200 B.C.; see his review in *Crozer Quarterly* (April 1952). See further Bleddyn J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions* (Cardiff, 1951), Chap. 7, "The Early History of the Septuagint"; Max L. Margolis, *The Story of Bible Translations* (Phila., 1917), Chap. II; Robert H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York, 1941), Chap. V (pp. 71-126), "Text and Versions of the Old Testament." Still standard is H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (2nd ed., 1914).

²Margolis, Chap. I; Roberts, Chap. 14.

³Roberts, Chap. 8, pp. 120-4, where reference is made to J. Reider's detailed *Prolegomena to . . . Aquila*.

⁴Roberts, Chap. 15.

⁵Roberts, Chap. 20.

⁶L. Ginzberg has written extensively on this aspect of Jerome (and other Church dignitaries); see his discussions of "Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern" (items 3, 4, 77, 84, and especially 90 and 96 in the Bibliography compiled by Boaz Cohen for the *Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume*, English Section, New York, 1945). J. A. Montgomery, *International Critical Commentary on Daniel* (New York, 1927), p. 56, put it this way, "Any study of Jewish commentary upon the Scriptures should certainly include Jerome . . ." C. H. Gordon wrote his doctoral dissertation under Montgomery on "Rabbinic Exegesis in the Vulgate of Proverbs," *Journal of Biblical Literature* (hereafter abbrev. *JBL*), 49 (1930), 384-422.

⁷For all these translations see Swete, Part I, Chaps. II-IV; Margolis, Chaps. II-III; Roberts, Parts III-VI.

⁸The date of the St. Mark's Scroll of Isaiah has not yet been determined. The estimates range from about the second century B.C. to about the third century A.D. (a radiocarbon test likewise permits this range), although some scholars suggest a date as late as the fifth-seventh centuries (Islamic period). In any case, this scroll has no value for the textual criticism of the Hebrew text of Isaiah. It was written carelessly (perhaps from dictation) and from memory, and was not copied, as any orthodox Jew would copy Holy Scripture, from another, reliable manuscript. This is amply clear from the sort of "improvements" and variants which characterize a text which is copied from memory (cf. Reider, *Jewish Quarterly Review* [hereafter abbrev. *JQR*], 7 [1917], n. 106 on pp. 299 f., with the references to Aptowitzer, Geiger, Margolis, Cornill, and Rahlfs, and with Margolis' additional reference to Rosenfeld. Several more references could now be added). Furthermore, this scroll derives ultimately from the same Hebrew text which gave rise to the preserved, Masoretic text; it does not derive from an earlier or superior text-tradition. However, whereas those Jews who preserved the text-tradition which finally developed into the Masoretic text were careful and reliable scholars, the scribes responsible for the St. Mark's scroll were very negligent. Perhaps they were not interested in reproducing the Hebrew text of Isaiah verbatim, as it had been handed down in their day; certainly they vocalized the consonantal text to accord with their dialect of Hebrew. Apart from helping to convince a larger number of scholars of the authority of the Masoretic text and of the reserve which should be employed in emending it, the St. Mark's scroll need never have been discovered, so far as the lower textual criticism of Isaiah is concerned.

⁹See my Chapter on "Margolis' Work on the Septuagint" in the Memorial Volume to Max Leopold Margolis, *Scholar and Teacher* (Phila., 1952). On how to handle the Septuagint text in the absence of such studies as Margolis' Greek Joshua, see my article on "The Septuagint—its use in Textual Criticism," *Biblical Archaeologist*, 9 (1946), 28-9.

¹⁰To the several references given on p. 153 and n. 14 in my Chapter (VIII) on "Current Progress and Problems in Septuagint Research" in *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*, ed. H. R. Willoughby (Chicago, 1947), I shall add here only Leo Prijz, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden, 1948).

¹¹It is no exaggeration to say that the critical apparatus in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* (2nd and 3rd editions) has become to many scholars more sacred and authoritative than the Hebrew text itself. It so happens, however, that the overwhelming majority of the twenty-four Books in the Hebrew Bible were done by scholars whose *forte* was not textual criticism (notable exceptions were S. R. Driver in the 2nd ed. and J. A. Bewer in the 3rd). The writer does not consider it in the least an exaggeration to assert that nearly every line of the footnotes in Kittel's Bible swarms with errors of omission and commission, as regards both the primary and secondary versions, and the quality of the Hebrew emendations proposed is all too frequently inferior. See further

pp. 149-55 in my Chapter referred to in n. 10 preceding; to the references made there to S. R. Driver and J. Ziegler, add also C. C. Torrey, *The Second Isaiah* (New York, 1928), pp. 214-5, "The apparatus of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* contains very many readings erroneously supposed to be attested by the Greek versions, readings gathered blindly from the commentaries . . ." It will be a great day for biblical scholarship when a completely new and really critical edition of the Hebrew Bible will be made available. As for the Hebrew (Masoretic) text, no single edition is more authoritative than the other; cf. my brief discussion in *JQR*, 31 (1940-1), 59-63.

¹³Not many scholars of the preceding generation equalled Montgomery in the discriminate understanding and use of the Septuagint, as witness his above-mentioned book on Daniel. His careful work is being followed up by his student Henry S. Gehman, and now the latter has a student who is continuing the fine tradition, John S. Wevers. In the latter's latest article, "Principles of Interpretation Guiding the Fourth Translator of the Book of the Kingdoms" (*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 14 [1952]), p. 40, n. 1-2, may be found some additional bibliographical data.

¹⁴This canon is of course common to the lower textual criticism of any group of documents. For the talmudic field, L. Ginzberg put it this way, "A cautious commentator will do well to avoid emending the transmitted text even when its corruption is obvious, so long as he is not able to explain the genesis of the present text . . ." (§33 and n. 27 in my article, "Studies in Talmudic Philology, I" in the *Seventy-fifth Anniversary Hebrew Union College Annual*).

¹⁵Cf. further my article in *JBL*, 59 (1950), 149-66; also *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 2 (1951), 151-4; *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 11 (July, 1952).

¹⁶It is the opinion of Torrey (loc. cit.) that "The 'Old Latin,' frequently cited in Torrey's apparatus [on Isaiah], is worthless, since it is merely a mediaeval rendering from the Greek." It is

well to be reminded by Montgomery (*Daniel*, p. 57), "As for the valuation of the testimony of the VSS, their real evidence is not obtained by the counting of noses—a theory generally accepted, but not generally practiced . . . The sub-versions have to be handled with care. They may not be treated as though they were prime versions, but only as representatives of their groups. So treated they are invaluable, but without laying down their generic history such comparison is most fallacious." Kittel's practice in his critical apparatus is precisely the opposite!

¹⁷The detailed arguments for the two passages discussed may be found in *JQR*, 26 (1935-6), 133-45; *JBL*, 63 (1944), 405-6 (on which see P. Katz, 65 [1946], 319-24). Peter Katz and Joseph Ziegler have been doing notable work along these lines; cf., e.g., the former's clarifying article on "The Recovery of the Original Septuagint, a Study in the History of Transmission and Textual Criticism" (in *Les Grandes Enterprises Internationales* at the Premier Congrès des Etudes Classiques, 1951, pp. 165-82) and the latter's masterly treatment of "Innergriechisch und innerlateinisch verderbte Lesarten im Dodekaprophe-ton" (pp. 380-99 in *Beiträge zum griechischen Dodekaprophe-ton, Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse*, 1943). In general, Ziegler's analyses of septuagintal and versional matters are models of perfection, as anyone can see for himself from a careful study of his editions of the Göttingen Septuagint of Isaiah and the Minor Prophets.

¹⁸See further in *JQR*, 25 (1934-5), 271-8; 35 (1944-5), 173-7; *JBL*, 65 (1946), 25-35.

¹⁹See my *Notes on the Qual Infinitive Construct and the Verbal Noun in Biblical Hebrew* (Offprint Series No. 22 in Publications of the American Oriental Society, 1947).

²⁰This word is discussed in *JQR*, 34 (1943-4), 281-97. For similar discussions by other scholars, see the references on p. 158 of my Chapter in *The Study of the Bible*, etc.

IV

The Literary Values OF THE REVISED STANDARD VERSION

JAMES MUILENBURG

Professor of Hebrew and Cognate Languages, Union Theological Seminary, New York City

IT HAS BECOME the fashion of modern times to write of the literary genius of the ancient Hebrews. In our schools and colleges courses are offered in "The Bible as Literature," sometimes because the state laws forbid teaching the Scriptures in any other way, sometimes because the Bible is viewed primarily as the deposit of an ancient culture, sometimes because the religion of the Bible, more particularly the Old Testament, is considered obsolete or irrelevant to the thought of modern men. Many years ago the writer prepared a volume of *Specimens of Biblical Literature*, in which the literature was classified according to its types and forms. A hundred pages of notes were appended at the close in which comments of an aesthetic nature were made and numerous parallels were drawn from modern literature. The trouble with this book and many like it is that they mistake the true character of the Bible and do scant justice to the life, history, and mentality that went to its making.

For the Bible is not primarily a literary work at all. Its origins lie in the dynamic and subterranean world to which the ancient Oriental was more sensitive than we, the world of living speech, where words are spoken and heard. In ancient Israel words have a primitive vitality and validity. To be sure there are exceptions. We think, for example, of that unrivalled sequence of narrative material which is preserved in II Samuel 9-20, I Kings 1-2, the story of David's decline, or of such court records as are included in I-II Kings, or of the temple archives. But by and large the Old and New Testaments are recorded speaking, and this is one of the reasons why they stamp themselves so indelibly upon the memory. The sanctuary stories about the patriarchs are recited and passed on from generation to

generation by the telling of them. The prophetic oracles are proclaimed with urgency and passion. Behind and within all of them we hear again and again the first of all biblical words: "Hear, O Israel!" The sages speak their wise sayings, and their pupils repeat them until the memory possesses them. Not least of all, Israel's words take the form of song, for Israel was granted the grace of singing to a pre-eminent degree. Narrative and poetry are her most congenial forms of speech, and they lie before us in the Bible in all the diversity and freshness and spontaneity of a people which lives close to the elemental realities of human existence.

Whenever the Bible has re-asserted itself in history it is these qualities of speech which have emerged with telling force. The great translators have felt instinctively that the Bible is the book of the people, addressed to the people and heard and understood by them. John Wycliffe writes in his *Apology*: "O Lord God! sithin at the beginning of faith, so many men translated into Latin to great profit of Latin men; let one simple creature of God translate into English for profit of Englishmen." To one of his despisers John Tyndale wrote the famous words: "If God spare my life, ere many yeares I wyl cause a boye that dryveth the plough shall know more of the Scripture than thou doest." In the first edition of the Greek New Testament, Erasmus wrote in the *Novum Instrumentum* of 1516 words that echo Tyndale. He is speaking to those who were unwilling that the Sacred Scriptures would be rendered into the vulgar tongue: "I wish that the husbandman may sing parts of them at his plough, that the weaver may warble them at his shuttle, that the traveller may with their narratives beguile the weariness of the way."

In our generation, as in the generations

of Augustine and the Reformers, the Scriptures are being read again. There is a world-wide hunger to hear them in their original and authentic accents. We are all of us aware of the great renaissance of Christian thought in our day and the new respect for the historical Hebrew-Christian tradition which marks this renaissance. The Christian Church is staking its claims in the midst of a world where rival sovereignties contend in almost demonic fury. But behind and within both these movements is the Bible. Like the period from the fall of Constantinople in 1453 to the prophetic activity of Martin Luther, this age is an age of translations. The Bible is being turned again into the language which may, in the words of John Tyndale, be "understood" of the people. Perhaps it is not too much to claim that the new Revised Standard Version is the major expression of this movement.

What shall we say, then, of its "literary" value? The first impression that one gains from reading it is twofold: on the one hand, it stands in the great King James tradition, and preserves much of the language and style of the King James, but, on the other hand, it is a modern version which speaks the language of our own time. The archaic usage of "thee" and "thou" is replaced by "you" when the reference is to man, but retained when God is addressed. The old "eth" endings of verbs are removed. Obsolete words disappear. Examine such a passage as Deut. 14:11ff. What is the meaning of "ossifrage" or the "glede"? RSV makes them intelligible by "vulture" and "buzzard." Or look at the description of the woman's wardrobe in Isa. 3:18-24. What are "cauls" or "round tires like the moon" or "crisping pins" or "wimples" or a "stomacher"? In the light of archaeology and improved linguistic knowledge the translators of the RSV are able to assign the correct meanings to these words and to improve the whole passage. What does "persuade" mean in I Kings 22:19, or "the spiritual man" in Hos. 9:7? Certainly not what we ordinarily suppose.

The removal of linguistic barriers and the elimination of archaic modes of speech are

obviously a great gain. But there is a second feature of the new translation, which, I suspect will be greeted by the average reader above all others. I refer to the simplicity, directness, and succinctness of the style. Many excessive words are stricken out because they do not belong in an English translation. Almost throughout the translation there is a clean economy of wording that produces a great impact upon the reader. The story of the sacrifice of Isaac in Gen. 22 has always been recognized as a superlative example of Hebrew narrative writing at its best, and one could scarcely imagine language that is more condensed and compact than this. RSV does full justice to this style. Or take another example from Old Testament poetry, the third chapter of Nahum. Let the reader turn to the King James or the American Standard Versions and compare them with such lines as these from RSV:

Woe to the bloody city,
 all full of lies and booty —
 no end to the plunder!
The crack of the whip, and rumble of wheel,
 galloping horse and bounding chariot!
Horsemen charging,
 flashing sword and glittering spear,
hosts of slain,
 heaps of corpses,
dead bodies without end —
 they stumble over the bodies!

Observe the succession of words, the breathless haste with which they follow each other, and the sharply chiselled impression that each of them produces. There are passages here and there in the translation where the wording appears studied, but they are not many. Throughout there is a careful avoidance of unusual, pedantic, or technical words. Innumerable hours were spent in finding the precise word, *le mot juste*. The committee scrupulously refrained from anything that might sound like fine writing. It did not try to improve on the Hebrew, though again and again the temptation arose to do so. The final verdict almost invariably fell to the simple, unadorned, and straightforward manner of the original text.

There is another literary characteristic of the Bible of which the reader is constantly

aware: its spiritual elevation and high seriousness. The thought of the Old Testament is centered throughout upon God, and the language reflects the profundity of Israel's sense of his presence. As the people called to be holy by a holy God, whose life was permeated in many ways by the activity of his holiness, her speech reflected the awe and wonder and inexpressible mystery of his presence. The King James translators felt this in all their work, and we feel their deep earnestness even today. The new translation breathes a spirit of seriousness; the religious quality of the original is nearly always preserved although it is inevitable that those who have grown up with the King James or the American Revised Versions may be offended by the changes that have been made. But such changes usually have good reasons behind them. There have been translations which in their attempt to be modern and colloquial almost produce an effect of triviality at times.

A much more subtle and difficult question is to what degree the RSV rises to the heights of truly distinguished style. Perhaps it is to the credit of most of the translators that they did not permit themselves to become too self-conscious on this matter. When John Keats first looked into George Chapman's *Homer*, he was carried away by the translation:

Then felt I like some watcher of the skies
When a new planet swims into his ken.

Sir Philip Sidney in his beautiful *Defence of Poetry* says of the Psalmist that he made his reader "see God coming in his majesty, his telling of the beasts' joyfulness and the hills' leaping—a heavenly beauty wherein he sheweth himself a passionate lover of that unspeakable and everlasting beauty to be seen by the eyes of the mind, cleared by faith." Whether the RSV succeeds in rendering the poetry of the Psalter, shall we say, in this fashion is left for others to judge. But one must not allow the effect of treasured memories of the old translations, memories that cluster intimately about one's deepest religious experience, to prejudice his evaluation of the new translation. All new

translations have a hard time with some of their contemporaries. Jerome and the King James revisers had their sharp critics. It may very well be that translations, like good wine, need the passage of time to give them maturity and substance. The present writer, who is doubtless prejudiced, can only bear his witness. With some fear and trembling he turned to several of the supreme passages of biblical speech. Among them were the following: Gen. 45:1ff.; 49:8ff.; Deut. 8; Judg. 5, Pss. 19, 23, 29, 64, 73, 139; Isaiah 52:13-53:12. What strikes one, first of all, is the degree to which the style of the King James is retained. But has the revision really improved matters? Of one thing we may be quite certain. The RSV gives us a more accurate translation, one that is more faithful to the original Hebrew and one that succeeds in reproducing the original form of the Hebrew. Certain books leave a more powerful impression than others, not only because the original is more moving but because the translation is better. Above all, the poetry becomes alive by the form in which it is given and by the feeling for structure which the translation shows.

It is at this point that the RSV seems to the writer to mark a definite advance over its great predecessors. In the King James Version none of the text is given in its poetic form although the King James translators had a remarkable feeling for the accent and stress of the original Hebrew. But the text lies before us as a vast succession of separate verses, each one following the other in exactly the same form, and there is no distinction between poetry and prose. It was not until 1753 that the true character of Hebrew poetry was understood. In that year Bishop Lowth published his famous lectures entitled *de sacra poesi Hebraeorum paelectiones academicae*. Next year the International Society of Old Testament Scholars will celebrate the two-hundredth anniversary of this event in their meeting in Copenhagen. When the American Standard Version appeared a century and a half after the publication of Lowth's lectures, the prophetic literature was still printed almost throughout as prose although Lowth had clearly

demonstrated its poetic form. Thus only fifteen per cent of the Old Testament appeared as poetry. The American Translation published by the University of Chicago Press, an excellent translation with a fine sense for literary form, recognizes poetry wherever it is present, and the prophets like the Psalms are given as poetry. The RSV also does justice to the original literary form with the result that forty per cent of the text is poetry.

The principle of poetic form which Bishop Lowth was the first to recognize is called parallelism. The single line forms the basic literary unit. It usually consists of two or three or four words. This line is followed by a second (or sometimes a third) which stands in a definite relation to it. The relation assumes many forms, but there are three or four which are especially clear. The second line may re-state the first, or it may stand in an antithetic relation to it, or it may build up the line in such a way as to form an ascending or stair-like relation. The most familiar illustration of this ascending parallelism is found in the so-called Psalms of Ascent (Pss. 120-134). The thunderstorm hymn (Ps. 29) is another famous example:

Ascribe to the LORD, O heavenly beings,
 ascribe to the LORD glory and strength.
Ascribe to the LORD the glory of his name;
 worship the LORD in holy array.

The voice of the LORD flashes flames of fire.
The voice of the LORD shakes the wilderness,
 the LORD shakes the wilderness of Kadesh.

It is not our purpose here to describe the character of Hebrew poetry. But it is our purpose to call attention to the great value in having poetry presented to us in its proper literary guise. Yet it would be an error to suppose that this is merely a literary improvement. Much more important is the fact that we are now rescued from the pitfalls of bad interpretation, at least from one of the major pitfalls. Many illustrations might be given of the results of the failure to appreciate the poetic form and the relationship of successive lines to each other. It will be observed that the RSV subordinates the second line to the first. The major

lines thus stand out clearly, and the second lines by their indentation show how they are connected with the basic lines.

Another formal feature of Hebrew poetry of the very first importance, but one which is much more difficult to describe or reproduce in translation is meter. In Hebrew the stress is not syllabic as in western poetry, but the accent falls on the important words. That is, the meter is a meter of meaning. We have all of us had the unpleasant experience of hearing someone emphasize the wrong words in public reading of the Bible, sometimes with terrible results. Or we have sung hymns where the whole stress comes in the wrong place, for example, on an article or preposition. Now the Bible lends itself to reading aloud for several reasons. For one thing its origins in living speech, in dialog and address, in speaking and in hearing, make it a wonderful instrument for public utterance. But there is another and perhaps a deeper reason intimately related to the first. If the translation is at all faithful to the original rise and fall of words, then the accent naturally falls on the key words, the so-called "brick words" of speech. I select a passage quite at random from the RSV:

Hear, O LORD, when I cry aloud,
 be gracious to me, and answer me!
Thou hast said, "Seek my face."
 My heart says to thee,
Thy face, LORD do I seek."
 Hide not thy face from me. Ps. 27:7-9

I cannot refrain from giving another illustration from the same poem:

For he will hide me in his shelter
 in the day of trouble;
he will conceal me under the cover of his tent,
 he will set me high upon a rock. vs. 5

The meter of these last lines is plainly 3'2', three accents on the first, two on the second. Into the psychological origins of this meter we cannot enter here, but faithful attention to the meter will reveal very clearly the profound emotional effect of such lines. For meter is not a mechanical or artificial contrivance, a self-conscious laboring to produce a pleasant impression on the ear. It

is rather the spontaneous and inevitable way in which the elemental rhythms of life and nature express themselves in the movement of words. Whenever thought is deeply felt and appropriated language tends to become rhythmical. This is why even the prose of the Scriptures often achieves a highly poetic character in the New Testament as well as in the Old.

A third illustration of the Hebrew sense for form is the strophic pattern of biblical poetry. Even a cursory examination of the poems of the Psalter will show the happy effect that is produced upon the eye. Instead of a long series of lines without any break or separation we have a series of stanzas or strophes, each with its distinctive form and character. If the reader will pay heed to these strophes, recognizing them by appropriate pauses and allowing the beginning and end of each strophe to assert themselves by proper emphasis and climax, not only he but also his hearers will experience, perhaps for the first time, something of the grandeur and rhetorical quality of the poetry of ancient Israel. One may well begin his reading with such a poem as Pss. 42-43, a literary creation of the first order. A poem of quite another kind, one of the great penitentials, will show what the recognition of form may do toward gaining an appreciation of Hebrew poetry:

Out of the depths I cry to thee, O LORD!
 LORD, hear my voice!
 Let thy ears be attentive
 to the voice of my supplications.
 If thou, O LORD, shouldest mark iniquities,
 LORD, who could stand?
 But there is forgiveness with thee,
 that thou mayest be feared.
 I wait for the LORD, my soul waits,
 and in his word I hope;
 my soul waits for the LORD
 more than watchmen for the morning,
 more than watchmen for the morning.
 O Israel, hope in the LORD!
 For with the LORD there is steadfast love,
 and with him is plenteous redemption.
 And he will redeem Israel
 from all his iniquities.

A good translation is a faithful rendering

of the original text. Such a rendering requires competence in the original language, a grasp of the various linguistic and grammatical disciplines, a sense for the great variety of usages a single word may have, and not least of all a feeling for the nuances of the original. But a good translator must do something more than reproduce the sense of the work he is dealing with. He must also reproduce the style and manner of speaking of one people into the style and manner of speaking of another. Moreover, he must employ the style that is characteristic of the particular literary genre. Now the Old Testament is exceedingly rich in the diversity of its literary types. It would be absurd to render a riddle, a fable a parable, an invective, an exhortation, a hymn, or a lament in the same style. Perhaps one of the difficulties of such great translations as the Vulgate, with its deep sonority and eloquence, or the King James Version, with its elevation of speech, is that the style is too uniform. Here, too, the RSV represents an advance. The literary forms are more apparent than in the old translations, and the diversity of style of the various forms is reflected more clearly. But finally, a faithful rendering of the Bible requires that we do justice in our work to the content of the Bible, to what the Bible has to say to its own time and to our time. For the Bible comes to us as the word of God, the revelation of God to his people and to all those who share the faith of his people. To translate such a work is indeed a solemn task and cannot be undertaken cavalierly or with too much self-confidence. For who is sufficient to such things? We shall never produce a final translation. Each people, each age, and each culture will produce new renderings. This is as it ought to be. If the translators of the RSV have in some degree allowed the biblical writers to speak for themselves in our contemporary English speech, they will have done well. But having lived with the sacred texts for many months and years and having listened to its words, they will all know that they are still unprofitable servants.

Recently Discovered Manuscripts AND THE REVISED STANDARD VERSION

JOHN C. TREVER

Executive Director, Department of the English Bible, Division of Christian Education, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

THAT MANUSCRIPTS have played an important part in the history of the transmission of the Bible message is apparent from the very beginning of its formation. We learn from Numbers 21:14, Joshua 10:13, and II Samuel 1:18 about a scroll of the "Wars of the LORD" and a scroll of "Jashar" ("the Upright?") from which songs are quoted by the early Bible writers. The books of Kings and Chronicles refer to numerous sources for the quotations of historic events and biographical details. The scroll of the "Acts of Solomon" (I Kgs. 11:41), the "Annals of the Kings of Israel and Judah" (I Kgs. 14:19, 29; 15:7, 23, etc.), and several other named and unnamed manuscript sources are apparent.

Not a single scrap of any part of any original manuscript of the Bible is known to exist today. The best of our knowledge about the text of the original must be based, therefore, upon manuscripts which are copies of copies of copies over many centuries of time for most of the books of the Old Testament, and two or more centuries of those of the New. Jeremiah 36 is a classic story of the fate of one original Bible manuscript, which, however, was rewritten and "many similar words were added to them" (Jer. 36:32)!

The discovery of manuscripts is not an entirely modern phenomenon, for the earliest record of such a discovery is found in the Bible itself—a discovery that influenced all subsequent history. In II Kings 22 we are told that a scroll of law was found by Hilkiah the high priest during repair operations in the Jerusalem Temple. Though the discovery was made in the year 621 B.C., we do not know how old the manuscript was. It was apparently old enough, however,

to be a complete surprise to the officials of Judah, which is not hard to understand when we consider the "Dark Ages" of Manasseh's reign in the seventh century B.C. When the scroll was read to King Josiah by Shaphan, his secretary, the king was so stirred by its contents that immediate steps were taken to carry out its precepts (II Kgs. 23:1-25). That manuscript may well be considered the foundation of the Bible as we know it today, for on it was a written record recognized as the "Word of God." Perhaps no manuscript discovery has had so great an influence on the course of religious history as that one twenty-five hundred years ago!

Interest in biblical manuscripts as a means of recovering the original text of the Bible, however, is relatively recent, contemporaneous with the Renaissance in Europe following the Middle Ages. For a thousand years (about 500-1516 A.D.) Jerome's Latin Vulgate version had dominated the Western world, while Rome directed the religious thought of the West. The invention of the printing press about 1450 brought to an end the problem of copyist errors in handwritten documents, while at the same time opening the door to the wider and more effective circulation of learning through the written word. In 1453 the capture of Constantinople by the Turks forced many Eastern scholars to flee to the West with precious Greek manuscripts of the Bible.

Early in the sixteenth century the great Dutch Greek scholar Desiderius Erasmus vied with the Spanish Cardinal Ximenes for the distinction of publishing the first printed New Testament in Greek. Though Erasmus' was available first in 1516, Ximenes' was actually published in 1514 though not re-

leased until after 1520. Erasmus used some eight late (after 1000 A.D.) and imperfect manuscripts, Ximenes a few others he had borrowed from the Vatican; but none of their manuscripts could be said to represent the original text in detail, but only the current "Byzantine" text with its many copyist changes and errors. Though Erasmus' Greek text was somewhat revised by Stephanus in 1550 and again by Baza in 1598, only a few additional manuscripts for the New Testament were available. Thus the "Textus Receptus" which resulted remained the late Byzantine text—a text based on less than two dozen late and imperfect manuscripts.

In the meantime, Jacob ben Chayyim published a Hebrew Old Testament in Venice in 1524-25 which became the "Textus Receptus" for all subsequent Hebrew texts until 1937. Ben Chayyim's text was claimed to be the same as the text carefully prepared in the ninth century by the famous Masorete Moses ben Asher, but we shall see that it was not. A ben Asher text considered in Jewish scholarly circles to be the most accurate text known, representing substantially the text of the Old Testament since its formal canonization in the late first century A.D. at the Council of Jamnia. This, then, was substantially the state of the Hebrew-Greek text of the Bible when the King James Version appeared in 1611. We might safely say that the text used for translating the Bible in the early seventeenth century was no earlier than the tenth century A.D., and that is being quite generous.

Anyone who would appreciate the great contribution which the Revised Standard Version of the Holy Bible has made to the understanding of the original text of the Bible must acquaint himself with the great strides which have been made, especially in the past century, in recovering the original text through the discovery of ancient manuscripts and patient biblical research. The printers' ink was hardly dry on the early editions of the King James Version when in 1627 the appearance of the great fifth-century Greek *Codex Alexandrinus* in England, a gift of Cyril Lucar, Patriarch of Constantinople, made obsolete the text of the Bible

available to those translators. But the real progress in manuscript research was still more than two centuries away.

It was the year 1843 that found the young German scholar Constantine Tischendorf in the Vatican library in Rome, examining a great codex briefly, one that turned out to be the best Greek text of the New Testament known—the fourth-century *Codex Vaticanus*. The next year found him at the Monastery of St. Catherine at Mount Sinai, where he spotted some pages of a Greek manuscript in a wastebasket, from which he was given forty-three of the 110 awaiting destruction. The story of how it took him fifteen years to find the rest of the famous fourth-century *Codex Sinaiticus* is one of the classics of biblical research. At last the text of the Bible could be traced back six hundred years earlier than that available in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Carried along on the wave of enthusiasm aroused by these great manuscript discoveries and the recognition of the more ancient and accurate text that was now known, the English and American Revised Versions were prepared in 1870-1885, though the latter was not published until 1901. But the story of the discovery of manuscripts had only begun.

Already before the publication of the American Standard Version papyrus manuscripts began to appear in Egypt to throw further light on the New Testament. One of the adventures in that field is told by Doctors Grenfell and Hunt during their excavations at Tebtunis along the Nile in 1900. To improve the efficiency of the local natives, hired to remove the dirt, excavators pay them an extra gift (or *baksheesh*) for any important discovery they happen upon. But all they were digging up at Tebtunis were mummified crocodiles! Some forty had been found when a native, working hard in the entrance to a large tomb, was sure something important would show up there. Working carefully when he came near the lower part of the tomb, he struck something hard, dug it up to find—another mummified crocodile! He was so angry he flung it from him. It landed on a

rock, bursting open. Inside were ancient Greek papyrus documents! There was a scramble for the pile of crocodiles, and hundreds of inscribed papyri were recovered to add to those already recovered from the rubbish heaps of ancient Egypt.

Shortly before the experience at Tebtunis, in 1895, the young German scholar Adolph Deissman, aspiring to the ministry in Marburg, had published his famed *Bibelstudien* in which he demonstrated the fact that the Greek of the New Testament was the same as that of the papyri, the common (*Koiné*), everyday vernacular speech of the first century A.D. Here were manuscripts of business, personal letters, legal documents, in the same Greek as the New Testament. At once new insights for New Testament translation began to appear. ". . . about my Father's business" (Luke 2:49) was found to be from an idiom which meant "in my Father's house"; the strange word "Raca" (Matt. 5:22) appeared in one document, making clear that it was an expression of insult; "James the less" (Mark 15:40) became "James the younger"; "Certainly this was a righteous man" (Luke 23:47) became "Certainly this man was innocent"; "the trial of your faith" (I Peter 1:7) became "the genuineness of your faith," to mention only a few illustrations.

Biblical manuscripts continued to appear in Egypt. In 1892 two manuscript enthusiasts, Mrs. Lewis and Mrs. Gibson, visited the same St. Catherine monastery at Sinai made famous by Tischendorf's earlier visits, and found this time a Syriac palimpsest, a manuscript whose original writing had been erased and reinscribed at a later time. The reappearing under-writing proved to be a Syriac translation of the Gospels, representing a Greek text of about the second century A.D., almost two centuries earlier than the famed *Sinaiticus*. In 1906 Mr. C. L. Freer secured a beautiful fifth-century vellum codex of the Gospels, which is now in the Freer Collection in Washington, D. C. In 1916 he purchased from a Cairo dealer a mass of papyri which, on treatment, proved to contain large sections of a third-century A.D. codex of the Minor Prophets, then the

oldest-known manuscript of the Old Testament. In 1913 the ninth-century *Koridethi Gospels* were made available, and in 1927 Dr. Edgar J. Goodspeed secured the thirteenth-century *Rockefeller-McCormick New Testament*, which, with its ninety miniatures is one of the most beautiful Bible manuscripts ever discovered. Though a late "Byzantine" text, the latter has occasionally proved helpful. More than four thousand manuscripts of the New Testament are available today, of which about two hundred are older than 800 A.D.!

The value of these manuscripts for the Revised Standard Version of the Holy Bible can be traced in many cases through the footnotes, when compared with editions of the original texts like Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* (3rd to 7th editions) and Nestle's *Novum Testamentum Graece* (17th-18th editions), noting especially the critical apparatus of each. In the New Testament it can be seen that the *Sinaitic Syriac* added its weight to *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus* in showing that Matthew 12:47 was not in the original text. Both the *Koridethi Gospels* and the *Sinaitic Syriac* add weight to *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus* to assure scholars that Matthew 17:21 should be omitted. On the other hand, *Koridethi* witnesses to retain "those who trust in riches" in Mark 10:24, while the *Freer Gospels* witness to its deletion, as in *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus*. In this case additional evidence was supplied by a third-century piece of papyrus from Oxyrhynchus on the Nile, which, meaning "Crocodile," was probably the source for the Tebtunis mummified sacred crocodiles. The longer ending for Mark (16:9-20) is omitted by *Sinaiticus* and *Vaticanus* with the *Sinaitic Syriac* adding support to its omission, but the later *Koridethi* and *Freer Gospel* manuscripts include it. RSV, therefore, has relegated Mark 16:9-20 to a footnote on the strong evidence presented by the earliest and best manuscripts, in addition to other factors. Here, then, are only a few of the thousands of illustrations in the New Testament where the recent manuscript discoveries have clarified the original text.

Then in 1930, Mr. A. Chester Beatty, an

antiquity collector visiting in Egypt, purchased from a Cairo dealer some matted masses of papyrus documents, looking a good deal like partly disintegrated blocks of wood. They were said to have been found by natives in jars in a Coptic cemetery about thirty-five miles south of Cairo. When treated carefully by the British Museum to separate the leaves one by one, three New Testament Greek manuscripts appeared, including the Gospels and Acts in one, the Epistles of Paul in another, and Revelation in the third, and eight manuscripts of the Old Testament. The Gospels, Acts, and Pauline letters proved to be older by a hundred years than any previous New Testament manuscript known, being from the third century, probably the early part. The earliest New Testament witness is a small fragment of a codex of the Gospel of John in the John Rylands Library in Manchester, England.

Perhaps the classic passage in which the RSVNT has benefited from the added evidence of the Chester Beatty papyri is Romans 8:28:

KJV

And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to *his* purpose.

RSV

We know that in everything God works for good with those who love him, who are called according to his purpose.

The fact that the Vatican, Alexandrian, Chester Beatty, and a few other early manuscripts contained the subject, "God," led the present revisers to conclude that it belonged in Paul's original letter. Another example is John 7:53—8:11 which has been relegated to a footnote in RSV, since all the manuscripts earlier than the sixth century and some later ones omit the whole passage.

Not always, however, did the revisers follow the Chester Beatty papyri just because of their greater age. In Mark 8:15, for instance, Chester Beatty, Freer, and Koridethi all have "Herodians," while RSV follows the more frequently appearing form "Herod." Each variant had to be weighed on its own

merits, taking many factors into consideration.

Dr. E. C. Colwell, in his recent book, *What Is the Best New Testament?* (University of Chicago Press, 1952) presents an interesting and instructive story of the history of New Testament manuscripts and methods of their use in recovering the original text. He emphasizes especially and describes the vast international manuscript micro-filming and study project now in process to gather all possible evidence for every part of the New Testament. Unfortunately however, the implications of his Chapter IX in which he puts the RSVNT sixth in line from the standpoint of accuracy, are most misleading. After using three chapters (VI, VII, and VIII) to demonstrate that no one ancient manuscript can be the final authority for recovering the original text, he proceeds to judge the accuracy of seventeen translations on the basis of their faithfulness to the Westcott and Hort Greek texts (1881), which is substantially a reproduction of the fourth-century Vatican manuscript!*

No implications for the accuracy of the RSVNT can be safely drawn from such a study. In fact, Dr. Colwell demonstrates by his method the danger of slavish adherence to any one printed text, excellent as it might be. The committee which prepared the RSVNT makes perfectly clear in their "Introduction" (p. 41) the principles which they followed in recovering the Greek text for their translation, and why they did not follow Westcott and Hort exclusively.

*He takes the sixty-four variants in the Gospel of John as the basis of his test, showing that the RSVNT fails to follow Westcott and Hort in eight of them. After checking which these eight are, I found that not one of them is a case of crucial importance and in all of them RSV seems to have been the result of the application of some other of the sound principles of text criticism than the one apparently followed by Westcott and Hort: viz., "the more difficult reading is to be generally preferred." It is surprising, in fact, to find the Westminster Catholic Version placed ahead of RSVNT in accuracy, when such crucial points as Mark 9: 6-20, John 7:53—8:11, and I John 5:7-8 are dogmatically included in the former. Footnotes are included, it is true, in this Catholic version to explain the probably spurious origin of the verses, but the inclusion of them certainly makes the version less accurate than RSV.

To complete our story, however, we must turn again to the text of the Old Testament to consider the progress of its recovery. The problem here is different, for there is not available a large mass of Hebrew Old Testament manuscript to compare, as for the New. Very few Hebrew manuscripts are available prior to the ninth century A.D. (See below). The translators, therefore, are dependent for early witnesses upon manuscripts of early translations. Already in the third century B.C. the translation of the Old Testament into Greek was begun. Thus a separate textual tradition can be traced through Greek manuscripts of the Old Testament, the earliest fragments of which are those from a papyrus scroll of Deuteronomy dating from the second century B.C. These were discovered in 1935 among other papyrus fragments recovered from mummy cases brought from Egypt to the John Rylands Library in Manchester, England. To these must now be added the dozen or more Deuteronomy fragments known as the Fouad papyri, in Cairo, Egypt, dating from the same time and exhibiting the interesting feature of the sacred name of God YHWH in square Hebrew characters. The next oldest Greek evidence for the Old Testament is from the Chester Beatty manuscripts (codices) of Numbers and Deuteronomy dating from early in the second century A.D. From the third century A.D. come the Greek papyri of the Freer codex of the Minor Prophets and other Chester Beatty manuscripts (Genesis, Ezekiel, Daniel, and Esther), and from the fourth century our largest Old Testament Greek sources are the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts again.

Add to the Greek evidence that of the Samaritan (representing a separate tradition of the Hebrew pentateuch from about the fourth century B.C. through manuscripts of the fifth century A.D. and later), the Latin Vulgate (representing a separate tradition of translation from the fourth century A.D.), the Syriac (whose tradition may go back to the second century A.D.), and the Aramaic paraphrases known as the Targums (whose oral tradition begins about the second century A.D., but whose manuscript evidences

are much later), and one has a fairly complete picture of the manuscript areas which must be considered for the Old Testament text.

Reference to the footnotes accompanying the RSVOT will help the reader to see how these manuscript sources have been used to help recover the original text of the Old Testament at many points. Often he will see notes referring to "Sam., Gk., Syr., Old Latin, Tg., Vg." and others in varying combinations. Then the reader will know that the Samaritan (Pentateuch only), Greek Septuagint, Syriac, Old Latin, Targums, and Latin Vulgate manuscripts have provided the source for the translation in the text. Space permits only a few illustrations:

What Cain said to Abel in Genesis 4:8 is recovered from the Samaritan, Greek, Syriac, and Old Latin manuscripts. Thus we will read the additional words, "Let us go out to the field" in RSV. The King James Version obscured the problem by translating the Hebrew word for "said" with "talked".

KJV

I Sam. 14:41

Therefore Saul said unto the LORD God of Israel, Give a perfect *lot*. And Saul and Jonathan were taken: but the people escaped.

RSV

I Sam. 14:41

Therefore Saul said, "O LORD God of Israel, why hast thou not answered thy servant this day? If this guilt is in me or in Jonathan my son, O LORD, God of Israel, give Urim; but if this guilt is in thy people Israel, give Thummim." And Jonathan and Saul were taken, but the people escaped.

An ancient scribe, while copying this passage, came to the word "Israel" when it first occurred, then continued after the third occurrence of the same word, omitting all in between (scholars call this type of copyist error, *homoioteleuton*, from the Greek word meaning "like ending"). Again manuscript of the Greek, Old Latin, and Vulgate translations have enabled the revisers to restore the original text. KJV put "lot" in italics to smooth over the difficulty, though it is not in the text, as the italics indicate.

In Proverbs 25:27 the many italicized words in KJV indicate the uncertainty of the Hebrew text, but with the help of the Greek, Syriac, and Targum manuscripts, the original text can now be reconstructed:

KJV

It is not good to eat much honey: so for men to search their own glory is not glory.

RSV

It is not good to eat much honey, so be sparing of complimentary words.

New developments, through recent Hebrew manuscript discoveries, have also had a bearing on the RSVOT. Through the vast researches of Dr. Paul Kahle, convincing evidence has been gathered to show that the "Textus Receptus" for the O.T., the Jacob ben Chayyim text, so long held to be the best, was actually a poor representative of the work of the famous Moses ben Asher of the ninth century. Dr. Kahle has shown that a tenth-century manuscript in the Russian Public Library in Leningrad (MS B 19^A), the British Museum manuscript of the Pentateuch (Or 4445), probably from the ninth century, and a codex of the prophets in the Karaite Synagogue in Old Cairo (copied—not perfectly, unfortunately—by Moses ben Asher's son, Aaron, in 895 A.D.) represent much more accurately the text of Moses ben Asher, and are used as the basis of the third (1937 and following) edition of the critical Hebrew text known as *Biblia Hebraica*, first edited by Rudolph Kittel.

During repairs being made in 1890 on the Synagogue of Old Cairo a storage room, which had been accidentally walled up during previous repairing, was found filled with discarded manuscripts. The Genizah, as such a room is called, is usually emptied periodically and the discarded manuscripts formally buried, but the Genizah escaped such treatment by chance, thus preserving thousands of manuscript fragments which were sold to various Western libraries. Dr. Solomon Schechter of Cambridge University, England, succeeded in purchasing the great bulk of them, over 27,000 of which have so far been listed and partially catalogued. Some two thousand of the more important ones have been mounted in glass for more

easy study. Dr. Paul Kahle found among these manuscripts many biblical and Targumic manuscripts which have aided in the critical notes of the new printed Old Testament. Among them were fragments of scrolls of Psalms, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, dating probably from the sixth to eighth centuries A.D., certainly older than the ben Asher texts. The writer had the pleasure of examining hundreds of these Cairo Genizah fragments in Cambridge in 1951 and found an additional fragment of the Psalms scroll not already mentioned by Kahle in his *Masoreten des Westens II*, pp. 66-95. Most of the Cairo Genizah fragments are so late that they have little value for textual studies.

The Committee for the RSVOT used this third edition of the *Biblia Hebraica* during their fourteen years of work on the Old Testament revision, and thus they had before them all these manuscript resources as collated by Dr. Kahle and other scholars. Most of the points of relationship of those manuscripts to the RSVOT are so small that a very detailed study of the new version would be necessary to uncover specific illustrations.

Then came 1948 with its startling news of a greater manuscript find, opening in scholarly circles a frenzy of discussion, writing, arguments, and debates. Although the first news of the discovery was not released until April 11, 1948, the story of the discovery began more than a year before. In the spring of 1947 a group of wandering bedouins were traveling along the shore of the Dead Sea some seven and a half miles south of Jericho when a goatherd chased a straying goat up the side of the cliff which marks the eastern boundary of the wilderness of Judea about a half mile from the shore. Noticing a hole in the side of a projection of rock, he tossed a stone inside, and heard a resounding crash as though an earthenware jar were breaking. Calling a friend, they entered the hole to discover a large natural cave within, and on the floor were tall jars, covered with bowls. Inside the jars, according to the story, they found rolls of linen cloth covering leather scrolls, the outer parts badly disintegrated with age.

Knowing nothing of the importance of their find, they took their curios to Bethlehem, where they were accustomed to trade. There a Syrian merchant friend directed them to the St. Mark's Syrian Orthodox Monastery in Jerusalem. After several weeks of negotiations, the Syrians purchased five of the documents from the bedouins. Unable to read the Hebrew script, they sought the help of others to determine their contents and nature. In November of 1947, others of the documents were offered to the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, and six badly disintegrated scrolls were secured. When the Syrians approached the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem on February 18, 1948, they were invited to the school with their scrolls. Then began a series of events which has startled the scholarly world, for the accumulated evidence concerning the seven extensive documents and hundreds of fragments indicates that they all must have been written between the latter part of the second century B.C. and the early part of the first century A.D. Such a discovery had been unthinkable among biblical scholars!

The story is well known now, having been told in many books and journals, but it will be many years before the full value of this fabulous discovery will be gleaned. Most of the documents contain materials never before known to scholars, and thus their translation and interpretation proceeds slowly.

Of immediate value for Bible translation, however, is the Isaiah scroll, which has already been published in full photographic facsimile. Though it varies little from the standard Hebrew text as far as matters of translation are concerned, there are many small points which will occupy discussion of the scholars for many years. The Old Testament Section of the Standard Bible Committee discussed the merits of each variant in the manuscript, and adopted fourteen of its readings which clearly contribute to the understanding of the text. These can be noted in the footnotes of the new version, where the expression "One ancient Ms" will be found. An interesting illustration of the small, yet important way, in which this

manuscript has confirmed scholarly opinion is found in Isaiah 14:4: "take up this parable against the king of Babylon, and say, How hath the oppressor ceased! the golden city ceased!" (ASV) One letter in the obscure word translated "golden city" is different in the new manuscript, but gives the verse more sense. Now it reads: ". . . you will take up this taunt against the king of Babylon: How the oppressor has ceased, that the insolent fury ceased!"

Note the marked improvement of Isaiah 23:2, 3, made possible by the recovery of the original reading of two words in the newly discovered manuscript, "your messengers passed over":

ASV

2 Be still, ye inhabitants of the coast, to whom the merchants of Sidon, that pass over the sea, have replenished. 3 And on great waters the seed of the Shihor, the harvest of the Nile, was her revenue; and she was the mart of nations.

RSV

2 Be still, O inhabitants of the coast,
O merchants of Sidon,
your messengers passed over the sea
3 and were on many waters;
your revenue was the grain of Shihor,
the harvest of the Nile;
you were the merchant of the nations.

In Isaiah 33:8 the correction of a single letter of the word translated "cities" both confirms the judgment of text critics and makes sense out of an obscure passage:

ASV

The highways lie waste, the wayfaring man ceaseth: the *enemy* hath broken the covenant, he hath despised the cities, he regardeth not man.

RSV

The highways lie waste,
the wayfaring man ceases.
Covenants are broken,
witnesses are despised,
there is no regard for man.

So it is, that the Revised Standard Version of the Holy Bible has had the benefit of many discoveries of ancient manuscripts, which have helped to recover the original text of the Bible at many points; and we may conclude by saying that it is therefore the oldest English Bible, yet the newest!

VI

Some Religious Education Values OF THE RSV WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO The Book of Amos

HERBERT G. MAY

Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College

THE REVISED Standard Version must be acceptable for use in public worship, in private reading, and in teaching and study. One of its important functions is thus in the field of religious education.

The Revised Standard Version is a new translation, and when we consider its values for religious education we must be concerned with the advantages it has over the other versions. Practically the problem resolves itself into a discussion of the advantages of the Revised Standard Version as over against the American Standard Version and the King James Version. It is true that some of the twentieth century translations, such as Moffatt's translation of the Bible and the Smith-Goodspeed Bible (i.e., *The Bible, An American Translation*) find occasional use in religious educational materials. But the denominational educational literature is based largely on the King James Version or, less frequently, the American Standard Version.

It must also be remembered that the modern twentieth century translations, such as those by Moffatt, Weymouth, Smith, and Goodspeed, are not church sponsored or authorized. By contrast the Revised Standard Version is an authorized translation. It is authorized by the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U. S. A. Its authorization is actually wider than this, for the original authorization vote was by the International Council of Religious Education (now the Division of Christian Education of the National Council), on behalf of the educational boards of the churches of the United States and Canada which are associated in it. There has been Canadian representation on the Standard Bible Committee and its Advisory Board.

At certain points it may be that the Revised Standard Version has no great advantage over some recent modern translations, but that is not a special concern for us here, for the Revised Standard Version is not in any vital competition with such modern translations for use in church school materials or in other aspects of the church's life. I would hasten to add that I do believe that at many points the Revised Standard Version does have advantages over the modern translations of the Bible. And in an important sense the Revised Standard Version is not to be classified as a modern translation. It is a present-day translation, in language which can be understood by the people, but it differs from the "modern" translations in that it is a deliberate revision, not a completely fresh translation. It is a revision in the tradition which stems from Tyndale through Coverdale's Bible, Matthew's Bible, the Great Bible, the Genevan Bible, the Bishops' Bible, the King James Version, the English Revised Version, and the American Standard Version. The Standard Bible Committee was instructed to revise the American Standard Version in the light of the results of modern scholarship "in the direction of the simple, classic English style of the King James Version."

An important religious education value of the Revised Standard Version may be found in its literary form, in comparison with that of the King James Version and the American Standard Version. The Revised Standard Version may be more easily read and understood as a result of its use of the kind of paragraphing, punctuation, and quotation marks familiar in modern usage. In contrast with the King James Version in which

each verse stood by itself, the American Standard Version had used modern paragraphing. Like the King James Version, the American Standard Version was overly punctuated and made wider use of the colon and semicolon than is the current practice. Neither used quotation marks. The fact that the Revised Standard Version has a more familiar literary form makes it advantageous for use in religious education.

The advantages of paragraphing and the use of quotation marks could be better illustrated in the narrative sections of the Bible than in Amos, where for the larger part we have only poetry. In the Revised Standard Version of the book of Amos we can see at a glance those portions of the oracles which are direct quotations of the Lord, and those in which the prophet addresses the people and speaks of the Lord in the third person. Chapter 5 is a good illustration of this. In the visions of Amos in chapter 7, where there is a dialogue between Amos and the Lord, or in verses 10-17 of the same chapter, where Amaziah's message to Jeroboam and the conversation between Amos and Amaziah are reported, the character of the narrative stands out sharply and clearly. Single quotation marks within double quotation marks indicate Yahweh's words to Amos which are quoted by Amos to Amaziah.

The literary form of the Revised Standard Version should appeal to both old and young, but it should make the translation especially attractive to the young folk who are becoming acquainted with the Bible for the first time. It presents the Bible in a form to which they have become accustomed through their studies in school and through their general reading.

Adequate paragraphing permits the reader to see the text in terms of sense units rather than as isolated verses. Individual sentences are seen in context, and there is less temptation to lift a verse out of its context. This should make for more accurate interpretation. The authors of the biblical literature did not write in artificial verse divisions. There are probably those who believe that the verse numbers were dictated by God to the writers. The first English translations did not possess

such versification. Tyndale's New Testament and Pentateuch, the Coverdale Bible, and others possessed what we might even call "modern" paragraphing. The first complete English Bible to arrange the text according to individual verses was the Genevan Bible of 1560, preceded by Whittingham's New Testament in 1557. Proper paragraphing is essential to accurate translation, for the author thought in terms of sense units, and his thought is more adequately represented in translation by paragraphing.

In poetry the sense unit is the stanza or strophe, which in Hebrew poetry is a poetic paragraph, with no necessary regularity of length. In such books as the Psalms a certain regularity in the length of strophes may occur, but this is much less common in the prophetic oracles. The King James Version made no recognition of poetic form. The American Standard Version recognized the poetic form of the so-called Books of Poetry (i.e., Job, Psalms, Proverbs, the Song of Solomon, but not Ecclesiastes), and certain poetic passages within the narrative portions of the Bible. Thus it arranged as poetry the Blessing of Jacob in Genesis 49, the Song of Moses and the Israelites in Exodus 15, three poems in Numbers 21, the oracles of Balaam in Numb. 23, 24, the Song and Blessing of Moses in Deut. 32, 33, etc. But it ignored the poetic form which characterized much of the writings of the prophets in the books of the prophets.

The arrangement of the strophes in the Revised Standard Version of the book of Amos illustrates well how the sense units stand out sharply. Regularities in literary structure and parallelisms in form and content are more easily appreciated. A casual glance at the oracles in 1:3-2:5 discloses the common literary form of the seven oracles arranged as seven strophes: each begins with the formula "Thus says the LORD:" which is followed by the couplet beginning, "For three transgressions of," followed by one or two couplets beginning with "because," and concluding with the announcement of the judgment, "So I will send a fire," etc. In contrast with the Smith-Goodspeed arrangement in Amos (except

in 3:2-8), the Revised Standard Version makes evident the couplet form of the poetry by indenting the second line of the couplet, or the tristich form by indenting the second and third lines.

If adequate representation of poetic form has any value in materials for religious education, the Revised Standard Version marks an important advance over the American Standard Version and especially the King James Version. The carefully arranged poetic forms of many of the prophetic oracles suggests something of the care taken by the prophets in the preparation of their oracles. Care in preparation is also implied by the fact that the prophets were able to repeat the oracles from memory sometimes perhaps years afterwards (see Jer. 36). The oracles of Amos may not have been written down for a considerable time after they were uttered. All of this has some bearing on the nature of revelation and the way in which the word of God came to the prophet.

If religious education materials should be presented in a form familiar to the student, the religious educator should welcome the avoidance of archaisms in vocabulary and grammatical forms. Some may reason that there is a certain religious educational value in having the Bible in what we may call "Bible English." They may think that such "Bible English" produces an attitude of reverence, as the Bible is set apart from other literature by its archaic phraseology. Some might even maintain that it induces a sense of mystery and the wholly other.

But my own reaction to this is that if the content of an accurate translation of the Bible, regardless of the literary quality of that translation, does not disclose the uniqueness of the Scriptures, then we have been wrong in our estimate of the unique values of the Bible, and we had better stop thinking of it as the textbook of the Christian faith. We should not have to depend on the strangeness of the language of the Bible to suggest the uniqueness of the Bible. The uniqueness of the Scriptures lies in something so far more important than anything suggested by an archaic phraseology, that such phraseology may even call attention away from what are

the real values of the Bible. The differences between the Bible and other literatures are vastly more than the differences between Elizabethan and modern English. Besides, there is often associated with "Bible English" a kind of otherworldliness which hints that the message of the Bible is relevant for another time and place than that in which we live. Professor T. H. Robinson has commented that the language of the King James Version, even where its meaning is quite clear, carries with it a certain detachment from contemporary life. Sometimes our attention may be so caught by the rhythm and quaintness of a rendering that we are distracted from any consideration of its real meaning. The Bible was written in a language understandable to the people of the day. It should be translated in language understandable to people of today. The Bible is more than a museum of quaintness and antiquity.

"Bible English" may actually be a stumbling block to faith. This at least seems to be the opinion of Professor C. H. Dodd, general director of a project of the British Churches to produce an entirely new translation of the Bible, one not a revision of any existing version. Dodd in commenting on the project describes it as an attempt to make a translation which will not awaken a sense of strangeness or remoteness, avoiding both archaisms and transient modernisms, a translation aimed at conveying a sense of reality, and above all a translation which will in some measure remove a real barrier between a large proportion of his countrymen and the truth of the Holy Scriptures. There are important implications in these sentiments for the religious educator.

Passing over the avoidance of certain archaic pronominal and verbal forms, we may note a few instances of avoidance of words with archaic meanings in the Revised Standard Version of the book of Amos. "For this liketh you" in the King James Version in 4:5 is an archaic meaning of the verb, and it was improved in the American Standard Version with the rendering "for this pleaseth you," but the Revised Standard Version more aptly translations "for so you love to do."

"Husbandman" in the King James Version and the American Standard Version in 5:16 has no reference to the "master" of a family, and is properly interpreted in the Revised Standard Version as "farmers." "Kine" in 4:1 of the King James Version is modernized as "cows" in the Revised Standard Version. Perhaps the most striking illustration of this sort in Amos is the use of "gin" in 3:5 in the King James Version and the American Standard Version, where we read: "Can a bird fall in a snare upon the earth, where no gin is (set) for him?" This is not comparable to putting salt on a bird's tail, and the Revised Standard Version enlightens us by translating "trap." Most of us know of this use of "gin" only in the term "cotton gin," and are more familiar with the uncontracted form "engine."

A number of illustrations could be given to show the avoidance of Hebrew idioms which sound strange in English, of mechanical literalism in translation, and of awkward unnecessary inversions of the sentence order. But the Revised Standard Version is something more than an improvement in the English of the King James Version and the Revised Standard Version. It is a more accurate translation, taking into consideration the findings of modern scholarship. The religious education advantages of this do not have to be labored. It is the ideal of religious educators that religion be based on truth, and not on error. The historical materials of religious education should be as valid and as accurate as possible. The person who insists on the literal inspiration of the King James Version is at some points basing his faith on error rather than truth, for there is no question but that at times the King James Version is seriously wrong. This is not to presume that the Revised Standard Version is free from error. No person or committee could make a perfect translation of the Bible. Biblical scholars will doubtless find many points where they will think the translation may be improved. New light will be shed on the biblical manuscripts and languages. But it is also true that the translators have made a sincere effort to take advantage of the not inconsiderable progress in biblical

research during the past three and a half centuries.

We may illustrate a few examples of improvement in the interpretation of Hebrew syntax and grammar. A great deal might be said about the proper interpretation of tenses. In 3:3-7 the present tenses in the Revised Standard Version are preferable to the future tenses of the older versions. Rather than the perfect tense "ye have borne" in 5:26 in the King James Version and American Standard Version, we should follow a tense sequence with parallels elsewhere and read a future tense, "You shall take up," as in the Revised Standard Version. In 4:1 we should read a purpose clause, not "Bring, and let us drink" (King James Version and American Standard Version), but "Bring that we may drink" (Revised Standard Version). Rather than an adversative clause in 1:4, 7, 10, etc., "but I will send fire," etc., in the older versions, the clause should express result or consequence, as in the new version's "So I will send a fire," etc.

Information from the cuneiform inscriptions may sometimes make possible a more accurate translation. It is now possible to recognize in 5:26 the two gods Sakkuth and Kaiwan, well known Assyrian-Babylonian star deities. The King James Version had read "the tabernacle of your Moloch and Chiun your images, the star of your God," and the American Standard Version was further from the correct translation with "the tabernacle of your king and the shrine of your images, the star of your God." But the Revised Standard Version reads: "Sakkuth your king, and Kaiwan your star-God, your images." In 1:5 the older version read "the house of Eden," and this reading has misled one scholar into locating the Garden of Eden at Damascus. But it should be rendered "Beth-eden," as in the Revised Standard Version, and it is the same district which appears in the Assyrian records as "Bit-adini."

The American Standard Version had already corrected "the river of the wilderness" in 6:14 to "the Brook of the Arabah," as also in the Revised Standard Version. In 8:8 and 9:5 what the King James Version rendered as "flood" is really "the Nile," as in

the Revised Standard Version. Our improved knowledge of the geography of Palestine and the ancient Near East is responsible for numerous improvements at various points in the Revised Standard Version.

An appreciation of the poetic form may sometimes clarify the text and make possible more accurate translation. A good example of this is 5:18. The King James Version has read here: "Woe unto you that desire the day of the LORD! to what end is it for you? the day of the LORD is darkness and not light." But the Revised Standard Version reads:

"Woe to you who desire the day of the LORD!

Why would you have the day of the LORD?

It is darkness, and not light," etc.

The first two lines form a couplet, and the last line of the verse is really the first line of a tristich which is completed in the following verse. The complete tristic reads:

"It is darkness, and not light,
as if a man fled from a lion,
and a bear met him."

It illustrates among other things how proper translation may at times have to ignore the verse divisions. See also 5:4, 5.

An important religious educational medium in teaching an appreciation of the nature of the translated Bible is the footnotes in the Revised Standard Version. Among other things, they disclose some of the problems of translation and of manuscript study. Although Old Testament and New Testament textual and manuscript problems naturally have considerable in common, yet each possesses its own distinctive problems, and something of this is revealed in the footnotes. The footnotes in the American Standard Version were important, although they have been too much neglected. They gave some Hebrew manuscript variants, indicated certain obscurities in the Hebrew text, noted the literal Hebrew where the text could not or should not be translated literally, gave possible alternative translations in a number of places, and transliterated a Hebrew word or translated a proper noun when it was necessary to do so to make clear the meaning of the text. The

Revised Standard Version also does this, and more. The use of the ancient versions in reconstructing an obscure or corrupt passage in the Old Testament gives the Revised Standard Version an advantage over the King James Version or the American Standard Version. When a reconstruction is made with the help of the Greek, Syriac, Vulgate, Old Latin, or other ancient versions, this is indicated in the footnotes, and, where possible, the literal meaning of the Hebrew text is added. Where a conjectural reading is necessary and there is no versonal help, this also is indicated.

Through giving attention to the footnotes, the general reader may be introduced to certain elementary problems of textual studies. He may be made aware of the significance of the ancient translations of the Bible into the vernacular. This may serve as an introduction to the history of the translated Bible. In certain modern translations one cannot be certain when the translator is rendering the Hebrew text or whether he is depending on one or more of the ancient versions. The reader of the Revised Standard Version is never left in doubt. Alternative readings given in the footnotes have some of the values of a commentary. There is room here to call attention to only three or four footnotes in the book of Amos. In 1:1 a footnote indicates that instead of reading "during two years before the earth quake," which would be the time of the beginning of Amos' preaching, the text could be translated "for two years before the earthquake," which would indicate the duration of the prophesying of Amos. In 3:9 the context and particularly the poetic parallelism give support to the reading of the Septuagint "Assyria" rather than "Ashdod." In 6:13 the Revised Standard Version has rendered in the translation two place names, Lo-debar and Karnaim, two towns in Transjordan, mentioned also elsewhere in the Old Testament. Neither the King James Version or the American Standard Version took notice of them here. But the footnote gives as an alternative possible rendering the literal meanings of the Hebrew words, i.e., "a thing of thought" and "horns." Finally, we may note how in

8:1, 2 the significance of the pun in Amos' vision of the basket of summer fruit is made clear by giving in the footnote the transliteration of the Hebrew words for "end" and "summer fruit," i.e., *qets* and *qayis*. The American Standard Version had indicated the pun in Jeremiah's vision in Jer. 1:11, 12, but not here.

The appearance of the new translation is an opportunity to do some general religious education in the matter of the nature of our English Bible. In a dramatic fashion which has few parallels in the history of the English-speaking Christian church, the Christian will be brought face to face with the fact that there is more than one translation of the Bible. Many may realize for the first time that the translation of 1611 is not the "St. James Version." When a writer in a religious article in a newspaper recently quoted from the Revised Standard Version, he received the following criticism from one of the readers: "You have quoted it essentially correct with changes according to man's standard of grammar." Charging him with misquotation at another point, she wrote: "Let us see and hear it as written in God's own words." It may be that many do not realize that the Bible was not originally written in English. There are still those who, in the words of the preface to the King James Version, "though they find no content in that which they have, yet they cannot abide to hear of altering." The decision of the Division of Christian Education of the National Council

to put into the curriculum of the leadership education program a course on the history of the English Bible is important. The function of the course is to provide perspective and instill a more valid appreciation of the nature of our translated Bible.

To conclude our discussion we shall quote, without comment, a verse of prose and a verse of poetry from Amos, in the King James Version and the Revised Standard Version. Both are rendered as prose in the King James Version.

Thus saith the LORD, As the shepherd taketh out of the mouth of the lion two legs, or a piece of an ear; so shall the children of Israel be taken out that dwell in Samaria in the corner of a bed, and in Damascus in a couch. (Amos 3:12, King James Version).

Thus says the LORD: "As the shepherd rescues from the mouth of the lion two legs, or a piece of an ear, so shall the people of Israel who dwell in Samaria be rescued, with the corner of a couch and part of a bed." (Amos 3:12, Revised Standard Version).

Shall horses run upon the rock? Will one plow there with oxen? for ye have turned judgment into gall, and the fruit of righteousness into hemlock. (Amos 6:12, King James Version).

Do horses run upon rocks?

Does one plow the seas with oxen?
But you have turned justice into poison
and the fruit of righteousness into
wormwood.

(Amos 6:12, Revised Standard Version).

The Word of Life

A SYMPOSIUM

It is comparatively easy to state that teaching the Bible is one of the objectives of religious education. It is more difficult to use the Bible effectively in promoting religious growth. But the effective use of the Bible in making clear the Word of Life is a basic problem in religious education.

"The Word of Life" was the theme of the program of the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. at its Annual Meeting in February, 1952. In the Lay Advisory Section four papers were presented on this theme.

We are indebted to the writers of the four papers for re-working their material for this symposium and we are also indebted to Thomas H. West both for his co-operation in arranging the original program and for assisting in getting the material for publication.

—The Editorial Committee

I

THE WORD OF LIFE -- What Is It?

JOHN C. TREVER.

Executive Director, Department of the English Bible, Division of Christian Education, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.; Representative of the Standard Bible Committee

WITH THE appearance of the completed Revised Standard Version of the Holy Bible on September 30, 1952, perhaps it is a good time to stop and reflect upon the question, "What is the Bible?" "Why should we know it?" "What is its relevance for today that we should live it and share it?" "Why should scholars spend their lives in study of the Bible?" "Why spend fifteen years preparing the most accurate and beautiful translation of the ancient Hebrew and Greek Testaments, as the Committee has done to complete the new version?" No other series of writings, sacred or secular, has received so much attention, has provoked so much patient study, has produced so many written documents based on it. Are such efforts justified?

There are some who believe that modern research and discoveries in the ancient world have reduced the Bible to a mere jumble of legends and primitive superstitions. Once a young freshman student at Oxford University was overheard to say, "The Bible is as outmoded as an oxcart on the streets of London." Many young people today would not be as blunt as that, but they nevertheless entertain serious doubts concerning the relevance

of the Bible for their lives in this twentieth century. Educated as they are in the fields of science, psychology, philosophy, sociology, and other subjects intensely relevant to modern life, they find it difficult to discover vitality in the Holy Book that has come out of the ancient past. Especially is this true as they try to read that message in the seventeenth century language of England, found in the traditional version of the Bible. Do the skeptics and the Oxford student have a point? If not, do we have an answer? Or must we merely revert to traditional pronouncements of the church, to time-worn phrases, platitudinous expressions of devotion that verge on fetishism? Do we have a dynamic imperative in our hearts that will enable us to stand up to defend and to state clearly the relevance of the Bible? Let us search our hearts to be sure we know whereof we speak when we say, "I believe the Bible is the inspired Word of God," or "The Bible is the Word of Life."

Modern science and discoveries relating to our physical universe have so changed our understanding of the world and the universe that it does not seem easy, especially to the young student, to accept what is so clearly

factual about the physical world, while at the same time saying, "I believe the Bible." Science and the Bible appear poles apart, despite the recent attempts among conservatives to show that there is no conflict. Without resorting to such pseudo-scientific approaches which start with the assumption that the Bible must be scientifically proved from a literal standpoint (as though one's faith depended on proving the literal authority of the Bible), let us face the fact of the problem at the outset of our quest.

It is somewhat sobering to realize that all the writings of the Old and New Testament, almost all the developments of theology, and all the history of Christianity until the last hundred years were cast against a cosmology of a geo-centric universe. Although Copernicus conceived his theory of a helio-centric universe in the sixteenth century and Galileo and Kepler in the seventeenth century undergirded it with the discovery of the telescope and amazing new facts about the universe, it is only in the last century that the impact of the new understanding of the universe has reached the average churchman. For more than three thousand years man was groping in his religion with a universe composed of an island of earth surrounded by water, covered with a canopy-like firmament from which stars dangled and among which a sun and moon moved to give light to the all-important earth. Beyond it all was only water, as far as man could conceive. Only recently has the full truth of a universe extending beyond one's greatest imagination dawned upon man. Such a revelation from God, and that it truly is, would naturally shake the roots of man's religious thinking.

There is no problem of conflict with the Bible here, however, when one realizes that the Bible is not a book of science. The writer of the first chapter of Genesis was not trying to prepare a scientific treatise on the structure of the universe, but rather he was witnessing to the fact of God in His universe. It is not how he conceived the universe, but how he related himself to that universe that makes his writings and those of others the Bible. The first step the skeptic needs to make, along with the literalist, is to recognize that the Bible is not a book

of science. One does not deny the Bible or his faith in it to make such an assertion, but now we are getting ahead of the quest. Let us proceed more logically.

Physically, the book we call the Bible consists of sixty-six divisions, with thirty-nine making the Old Testament (literally the "Old Covenant"), and twenty-seven called "the New Covenant." The word "Bible" comes from the Latin word *Biblia*, which was the plural form of the Greek word *byblion*, meaning "scroll." Literally, then, "Bible" means "scrolls," the form in which it originally circulated. The Jews by the second century A.D. officially recognized twenty-four Hebrew scrolls as the sacred "Word of God," while the Christians of the first century A.D. recognized those same writings in Greek with an additional thirteen, later termed the "Apocrypha." Roman Catholic Bibles today include these additional thirteen books scattered through the Old Testament since they are based on the Latin Vulgate of Jerome which preserved the traditional number of books in early Greek Bibles. Only gradually did the Christians adopt the twenty-seven writings, today called the "New Covenant," as the Word of God. These particular sacred documents were written over a period of more than a thousand years. Much more religious literature was written, however, but only these came into the collection called the "Bible." Most of the manuscripts witnessed by the fragments and scrolls found in the Dead Sea cave were apparently of a non-biblical nature, yet they were part of a sacred library of some Jewish sect. A long period of sifting of religious literature preceded the selection of the particular book we call "Bible" today. Physically, therefore, the Bible is a library of sixty-six sacred writings preserved on scrolls in the early times, but later copied in "codex" form with which we associate our modern word "book." (The earliest evidence of the codex is a papyrus fragment of the Gospel of John from the second century A.D., now in the John Rylands library in Manchester, England.)

So far, then, the Bible is only the religious literature of a particular people from a particular period of history. We go to other

countries and peoples, however, and we find they too have their sacred literature: for the Muslims it is the Koran; for the Parsis (Zoroastrians) it is the Zend-Avesta; for the Hindus, the Vedas, Upanishads and Bhagavadh-gita; for the Buddhists the Tri-Pitaka, and so forth. By what authority can we say that the sixty-six books of our Bible are the "inspired Word of God"? What right have we to put these writings apart and above the rest of the sacred literature of the world? What do we have beside assertions and quotations from the Bible itself to convince our Oxford skeptic that the Bible is the Word of Life?

Do the contents of the Bible reveal the answer? It records great historical experiences. Abraham moves out of the north into Canaan, Moses leads the people out of Egypt, David settles the Philistine problem and builds a great kingdom, the prophets proclaim their "thus says the LORD," the Exile molds a few faithful people, Jesus preaches, teaches, is crucified, but lives; Paul converts thousands. Biblical history moves swiftly, but the Bible is more than history.

The Bible is great literature. There are moving graphic narratives; there is sublime poetry in the ancient hymns, devotional literature and prophetic utterances; there are dramatic elements; there are profound sermons, pithy sayings—the whole gamut of literary devices. The late professor Carl S. Knopf used to tell his students that they should be *posted* on the literature of the Bible, for it contains Poems, Orations, Stories, Tracts, Epigrams, and Drama! But the Bible is more than great literature.

The Bible records biographies of great people. We are impressed with the characters of men of vision and noble stature. Even part of the long list is impressive: Abraham, Moses, Saul, David, Elijah, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Nehemiah, and for Christians, especially Jesus and Paul, to name only a few. There is a feeling of pride in the heart of the Jew and the Christian as he reflects on the panorama of his human heritage. But the Bible is more than biographies of great men.

History, literature, biography—the Bible contains all; but separately or together, they

cannot account for the "Bible" as the "Word of Life." Other great religious literatures have most of these elements too. Objective comparison of these elements might give those of the Bible some advantage, but they could not account for the essence of Bible. The answer must be sought beyond the realm of scientific research and discovery. The final answer can only be found through the eyes of faith. We can earnestly and honestly study the history, the literature, and the biographies of the Bible, but without the eyes of faith our search will fail to uncover the secret of the "Word of Life"—the power of the Bible message.

There can be, however, an element of objectivity in the search if we review the history of the impact of the Bible on life through the centuries. The testimony of history is a witness to the fact that this special literature has had a dynamic impact upon society. The Bible has molded lives, and that fact of itself draws our attention toward it. But the witness of history is a witness to the fact of faith, through which the impact of the Bible on life has been possible. Those who found new life in the Bible message, history tells us, have been those who examined its message through the eyes of faith, then something happened!

One of the greatest contributions of the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament to the understanding of the Gospel message is found in Romans 1:17. The former translation, "The just shall live by faith," influenced as it was by Habakkuk 2:4 from which Paul was quoting, moved many lives nearer to God. The new translation, however, is not only more accurate, but also it should be even more significant in its impact on lives: "He who through faith in righteous shall live." Here we come close to the very essence of the biblical message. We might paraphrase this great verse for our quest thus: He who through faith has entered into the fellowship of the saints of the Bible discovers life. He needs no objective evidence to prove the essential and central importance of the Bible. Its message has done something for him, and that is the evidence for which he is seeking. He has experienced something new in life.

God has come in! Life takes on a new focus.

He asserts with conviction based on experience that the Bible is the Word of Life. Through the eyes of faith two basics then emerge as the essence of this Word: 1) the fact that God is at work in history. He has created this universe and has a plan for this world. He has created this world for construction not destruction. From "In the beginning God created . . ." of Genesis 1 to "Then I saw a new heaven and a new earth . . ." of Revelation 21 the Bible writers keep constantly before us the fact of a creative God. 2) Through faith the Word of Life links man to this creative purpose of God. Life lived in reference to God becomes different. It is real life. Love, peace, brotherhood—all the positives of life—emerge when a life is perfectly tuned to God. We think of Paul's classic description of such a life: "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control; against such there is no law . . . If we live by the Spirit, let us also walk by the Spirit. Let us have no self-conceit, no provoking of one another, no envy of one another" (Gal. 5:22, 23, 25, 26 RSV). To be sure, the records in the Bible do not show all men in such a relationship, for the Bible records life in all phases, from man at his worst to man at his best. Man is seen both in his ignorance of God as well as moved by the revelation of God. For the Christian, of course, in Jesus is seen the full revelation of all the truth, the final proof for his faith. But in the Bible all of life is seen in reference to God. History, literature, biography are viewed in relation to God, and the Word of Life becomes clear.

Here then is the "least common denominator" of the Bible, the foundation of faith on which all Protestantism can build cooperatively. He who believes in the "verbal inspiration" of the Word can walk in harmony with him who seeks the records of the Book as a "progressive revelation" preserved through the fallible and oft-failing instrument, man. Both see through faith the Word of Life revealing the creator God and man's relationship to Him and His creation.

Theological emphases, dogmas, traditions, interpretations may differ among denominations and may even seem essentials, but this foundation of the Word is secure for all. All will say the "Word of God" is much more, but the added features are mostly matters of emphasis rather than basics and may become the bases of divergences among Christians.

Here then is the *raison d'être* of the Bible. It is man's link with eternity. It is not the literature, the books themselves, not the paper on which it is written, not the words into which it is translated, not any particular group of books or any particular section. It is a message of life, for life, that beckons all of life to God.

The Bible grew out of the living experiences of men who struggled with life to discover its realities. Their greatest discovery was the primary and essential fact of God in His world. He created it and continues to create in it. He has a plan for it and for the man whom He created to live in it. This creature of God discovered that he could not live in defiance of or even apart from God and find meaning in life. These discoveries which came out of his experiences of living were recorded in ancient times—many more experiences were recorded than are now in our Bible—and in the process of time certain experiences and certain discoveries, tested and tried, proved to man that God had spoken. These were brought together into the series of sixty-six books we call the Bible. The name "Bible" regardless of its etymology is inseparable from the "Word of God." Its message has, since its writing was completed, been mixed in the crucible of human experience, shaped on the anvil of passing time, and tested repeatedly in the fires of world tragedy. It has not failed at any point, for the witness of history reveals the power it contains.

Through eyes of faith, therefore, man is led by the Bible into the presence of the creator God, and life becomes linked to and molded by that Divine relationship. And seeing his new experience as a part of the plan of God, he concludes that the Bible is "the inspired Word of God."

II

THE WORD OF LIFE --

Know It

RALPH D. HEIM

Professor of Christian Education and English Bible, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

Introductory Questions

DOUBTLESS FIRST we ought to establish mutual understanding about three preliminary questions and answers.

The first question: What is meant by "The Word of Life"?

Briefly, I understand it to be the communicative aspect of God's being. It is the personal, vital, dynamic reality of God who is eternally striving to enter the lives of his children with a certain purpose. The purpose is that those children may henceforth, in a living way, know their Father's nature and will. Therefore, The Word of Life is God, giving knowledge, in the process of nurturing human life.

By the literary usage called accommodation we say that the Bible is The Word of Life. That statement is inaccurate, though, if taken to mean anything resembling a complete identification of the two: "Bible" and "Word of Life." The Bible is rather a repository of printed words that, on the one hand records the way in which The Word of Life ministered to men in history and that, on the other hand can release The Word of Life into human personality today. As such, of course, it is infinitely precious.

A second question: What is meant by "knowing it" as related to The Word of Life?"

"Knowing it," when considered in a basic way, means vastly more than knowledge in the sense of intellectual acquaintance with facts. Fundamentally, knowing means complete acquaintance to the full extent of all one's experiencing powers, especially acquaintance in response. For convenience in this article, though, we shall be letting ourselves, most of the time, think of knowledge in the more limited and conventional sense.

Even so, the three — know it, live it, share it — are but three concomitant phases of an

essential unity. You cannot separate them; you can only try to look at each of them alone for a while in order to understand the whole complex a little better.

Further, I understand "live it" to be the central and binding phase of the totality. "Know it" is largely a contributory phase; "share it" is chiefly a byproduct phase. To complicate things still more, each of these is simultaneously one and the other. As examples: we know The Word as we live it; we live it as we know it; we share it as we live it. All in all, the whole is a life-giving cycle; the result, finally, is more life for self and others.

Yet, for the moment, we shall avoid as many complications as possible and for the sake of clarity allow ourselves to think largely about knowing The Word (a) apart from the other phases of the theme and (b) in terms of the primarily intellectual element of our personalities.

Third question: What is the basic function of the Bible in this relationship? We must recognize that there were people who knew The Word of Life before there was a Bible. Likewise, there are people who know The Word of Life and yet never saw a Bible. Also, there may be people who know the Bible and yet do not truly know The Word of Life.

What, then, is the Bible's function?

I understand it in terms of *resource*, a word which is not by any means equivalent to "reference book," as some have charged. The Bible is not by any means only a choice religious encyclopedia or a glorified moral etiquette book. It is a *resource*, a much more profound instrument.

This is to say, figuratively speaking, that the Bible is such things as these:

An invitation to Christian reconciliation.

A "hormone preparation" to start the growth of the Christian faith.

A cistern for water and a granary for bread to nurture Christian existence.

A sun to shed light on Christian conduct.

An album of recordings to keep the Christian spirit harmonizing.

A dynamo to charge the human battery with Christian potential.

A "pile" of power for chain reactions toward Christian attainment.

The Bible is such a resource because it serves as a vehicle through which God enters human lives to render them abundant in all proper dimensions. Through the Bible, The Word of Life eternalizes human life.

As the theologians would put it, the Bible is a means of grace. Not the grace itself, but the means of its operation. Through this means, according to Luther's mode of expression:

"The Holy Spirit has called me by his gospel, enlightened me with his gifts, sanctified and kept me in the true faith; even as he calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies the whole Christian church on earth and keeps it with Jesus Christ in the one true faith."

At the risk of belaboring the point, we shall be a bit more specific, The Bible presents examples of Christian activities in performance (Paul's work); statements of principles about those activities (Beatitudes); instances that show forth human values and penalties (Peter's life); statements of divine sanction and disanction (Commandments). Through these things, God becomes effective to enrich and control individual and group life. He enriches life through the biblical beauty and piety. He controls life, too, by biblical guidance and stimulation and empowerment. The total result can be called, perhaps, salvation.

Now we can settle down to what I suppose our principal inquiry ought to be: How Shall People Come to Know the Word of Life, especially through our educational use of the Bible?

The Knowledge Element in the Christian Life

We begin by considering the place of knowledge in the Christian life.

Already I have tried to make it clear that I do not consider knowledge, really, to consist only of intellectual apprehending al-

though we are allowing ourselves to be limited largely to that definition.

Also, now I wish to state, I do not consider the knowledge phase of Christian education, when we use knowledge with that limited meaning, to be the central concern in Christian education. I hope you can agree with that.

If so, you too, will say that to teach is not, fundamentally, to deliver inert ideas from one mind to another—to get that which is imprinted on an India paper page of the Bible imprinted on the mental page of a pupil. To teach, really, is to help a pupil—a human individual—to live as a Christian, a growing Christian.

The precious materials with which a Christian teacher works are, basically, two. On the one hand he is dealing with The Word of Life; on the other hand, with pupil life. Intermediately, the Bible is a resource for bringing God and the pupil into a life-giving-and-receiving encounter.

Now to the point: knowledge, even in its limited sense, does enter into the process.

I like to think of the Christian pupil's faith-life as a rope of eight intertwining strands. Those eight strands represent a certain eight activities which I shall name soon. The eight make up the total system of activities we call a life. They are the observable nature of that psycho-physical complex we call a person. Integrated by a personality, they are the child, the youth, the man, the woman.

For our purpose now, we must examine a cross-section of that rope. So, imagine a glass-slide on which we have placed a cross-section slice of it. Here are the severed ends of the eight strands, ready to be scrutinized as to their constitution.

Let us imagine, also, that we have an ink with magical properties. When we brush this liquid over the cross-section of the Christian faith-life, the fluid will stain all the knowledge elements so that they appear in a bright, red color.

We wield the brush.

And behold, everywhere we see red dots! Throughout each of the eight activities that

make up the Christian faith-life there are knowledge elements.

Let us consider the eight activities, in reverse alphabetical order for a reason which will appear later:

1. Attaining the highest realization of the SELF.

We possess knowledge of self and the values in which the self can find its realization; also the means by which it can have those values.

2. Having personal acquaintance with RELIGION.

We possess knowledge of religion in general, of other religions, and especially of our own particular faith.

3. Cooperating in good will with OTHERS.
We have knowledge of the major points of need for good will and of the technique for making it effective.

4. Employing the processes and products of NATURE beneficially.

We know how sadly we abuse the good things of the natural world and along with this we realize the constructive possibilities.

5. Maintaining discipleship with JESUS.
We have knowledge of Jesus' life and teachings and proper manner of being a disciple.

6. Giving supreme loyalty to GOD.
We have gained some knowledge of God's nature and will and of the demands of loyalty and privilege and sonship.

7. Practising effective CHURCH membership.

We do know, or should know, about Church history, organization, work, and worship. Also we understand our vocation for it.

8. Using the BIBLE fruitfully.

This eighth of the Christian activities which make up the rope of the Christian faith-life, the rope whose cross-section we are examining to consider the knowledge factor in them, is the item about which we are primarily concerned in this article: using the Bible fruitfully. How does our cross-section of that activity look on this slide where we have stained its knowledge elements red?

Well, it is peppered with red dots, of course. There are many primarily intellectual components, facts, memory items. Yet the cross-section is not all red, because knowing the Bible isn't the whole thing; it isn't even the principal thing, although it is indispensable. There are also those com-

ponents which are primarily emotional and those which are primarily volitional. Most of all, there is an integration and a unification of them into a functioning utilization of the Bible in the totality of the Christian faith-life.

Knowing The Bible

Recognizing, then, that knowledge elements are needful and significant although not exclusive in fruitful use of the Bible, what is the situation as to knowing the Bible?

The Situation: Effort

We are working at it; there is no doubt about that. In fact, we are working harder at this than we are working at anything else in Christian education. A research, to which I shall refer later, discloses that the major purpose evident in our educational use of the Bible is to get people in possession of its factual content.

Our educational use of the Bible goes on in eight principal areas:

- The Arts (music, drama, literature)
- Group Study (as in the Church School)
- Mass Media of Communication (publications, movies, broadcasts and telecasts)
- Personal Study
- "Personal Work" (counselling, evangelism)
- Public address (sermons and others)
- Worship
- "The Living Epistle"

We conduct educational use of the Bible through a multitude of agencies. One could probably think of fifty; I have selected only a half dozen:

- The Church School classes — Sunday, Vacation, Weekday
- Confirmation Classes
- Youth Fellowships
- Camps
- Leadership Education Schools and Classes
- Colleges and Universities

Within those agencies we have at least fifty ways of teaching and all of them, likely, are used in educational use of the Bible. Here are just ten principal ones:

- Audio — Visual Aids
- Discussion
- Dramatization
- Handwork
- Lecture

Questions-and-answers
Reading
Research and Report
Story-telling
Writing

As for housing, equipment, and supplies, we are using more trainloads daily.

As for numbers engaged in educational use of the Bible, the Sunday Church School is represented around the world—on every continent and on many an isle with something approaching fifty million pupils and five million teachers in five hundred thousand schools.

What about our results?

The Situation: Results

Do the people know the Bible?

They do not (as a general statement, only slightly exaggerated).

That is a stark fact that ought to haunt every prospective Church leader.

I shall even venture a step farther. People do not comprehend the Bible. (Again this is a general statement, slightly exaggerated of course, but only too true.)

One young researcher who wanted to discover whether Senior High School pupils can understand better the Standard Revised Version of the New Testament or the King James Version discovered that they do not understand either one very well. Most passages mean only something like "Johnny, be good."

Again, many people are in error about the Bible and its teachings. People should long ago have known some of the things they still want to know. But more: many of the things they want to know cannot be known until their misunderstandings are corrected.

Thus we must speak not only of widespread illiteracy but also of error which leads to stultification.

That is the sad truth concerning knowledge of the Bible—that significant component of that important strand of the eightfold rope which represents the Christian faith-life, namely, using the Bible fruitfully. That is the truth concerning people's knowledge of the Bible which is universally recognized as the vital resource in knowing The Word of Life.

What shall we do about the deplorable situation?

The Remedy: in General

We must not be so optimistically content with superficiality and mediocrity in Christian education. If this is not serious business, let us liquidate it. If it is important, let us do it with the money, energy, time, and talent that it merits.

Earlier, eight areas in which educational use of the Bible is being undertaken were listed. There is need for higher efficiency in all those eight areas. The many agencies for educational use of the Bible were mentioned and six of them named. All those agencies need to be in maximum production. Fifty ways of teaching were suggested. We must recognize that all techniques of teaching are always subject to improvement and be about the task. Trainloads of materials, we observed, are being used. They need to be used well. There are fifty million pupils in Sunday Church School classes. They should be assured a profitable hour if no more. This is a time for renewed commitment to full effort concerning knowledge of the Bible, even on the lesser level of intellectual mastery, not to speak of the final purpose of fruitful use of the Bible toward a living knowledge of The Word of Life.

The Remedy: More Specifically

Reference was made above to the findings of a certain research. That seven-year study concerned *The Bible in the Literature for Christian Education*. Fifty thousand Scripture references were studied along with their age group placement in all kinds of Christian educational materials in the United States, Canada, and Great Britain.

When we ask how we can remedy the situation so as to get more satisfactory results in knowing the Bible—ultimately fuller response to The Word of Life—the findings of that study seem to provide important suggestions. I shall bring you three of them (although there may not be general agreement about the first one).

1. The study provides abundant evidence, I believe, to show that the background philosophy which determines our present selection, method, and purpose in educational use

of biblical materials is overwhelmingly traditional. That is to say that we are trying principally to transfer the traditions of the past into the minds of the present generation so that those traditions may be preserved. Incidentally, of course, it is hoped that the information will be useful to the pupil at present or, at least, in the future. However, I believe that we shall fare better, even as to knowledge of the Bible, if we cease working with that traditional outlook and undertake our task with the developmental or functional approach. Then we shall work directly at the living of the life, using the Bible as a *resource*, instead of working directly at the inculcation of biblical knowledge with the hope that the life may result.

2. This study discloses unquestionably how all our vaunted confidence that this is a day when we make graded use of Scripture is only an hallucination. The situation could not be very much worse, actually, if we were to set up a system which would use Genesis for three-year pupils, Exodus for the four-year-olds, and would finish somewhere in the sixties with Revelation. We need to use the biblical materials which are really relevant to pupil concerns.

3. Again, the research data indicate that we are using as many as two thousand, three hundred ninety different passages of Scripture in our various types of printed material. If he were to use one of these passages every Sunday, a man would require nearly fifty years to consider all of them even once. Is that the way to get real knowledge of the Bible? Possibly we could do better all around if we were to use one-tenth as many passages and use them well.

Summary

The situation as regards knowing the Bible is clearly enough not good. As for the remedy, there is room for nothing less than a more or less complete reconstruction in our church educational system if we genuinely intend to develop a generation that knows the Bible. We shall never get it according to current procedures. And let us not blame any particular persons like Stalin or groups such as parents, or even the isms. There is

only one way: get to work right at home in our congregations vigorously.

And now. Already we lament a lag of moral and religious growth behind other forms of development. That lag is only to be expected under the current conditions. Moreover, it will only grow worse until the remedy is applied.

Knowing The Word of Life

There has been no leniency in deplored the current situation with regard to biblical knowledge and little restraint in pleading for a vigorous attack on current ignorance of the Bible.

Yet that is not the end of the matter under discussion; indeed, it is not the principal point of it. *Knowing The Word of Life* is knowing God — his whole being with one's whole being. This is not the same thing as knowing the Bible however intimately such knowledge is related.

If we agree, we may arrive at a startling conclusion, namely, that to work in our Church schools as if knowledge of the Bible is the fundamental purpose and procedure of Christian education is one of the prime errors in the Church today.

Are we ready to correct that error?

Do we recognize the proper place of content in all education — as means to end?

Do we understand the proper place of the Bible in Christian teaching — as resource?

Are we dedicated to the true and full purpose of our educational effort that all may live the total Christian faith-life, knowing *The Word of Life* in that complete way?

Are we prepared to effectuate that purpose wisely and widely, whatever the cost?

Perhaps this article's lesson can become a certain motto. We began by announcing this title: *The Word of Life: KNOW It*. That title can now be rendered as *The Word of Life: Know IT*; or to make the motto complete: *The Word of Life: Know It, The Bible Aiding You*. This is the proposed motto for every Christian educator for himself; also, it will be his goal that his pupils shall Know *The Word of Life*, the Bible aiding them.

III

THE WORD OF LIFE --

Share It

MERRILL POWERS

Executive Secretary, Board of Education, Rock River Conference, Methodist Church

JUST AFTER sundown, in the darkest days of "The Bulge" in December of 1944, a commanding officer and his senior chaplain were walking back down the railhead after "seeing off" upwards of a thousand young men. These replacements were to be in the fox-holes before day-break; and we hoped they might stem the enemy tide rolling over our lines. Just as we reached the Jeeps, the Colonel said, "Well, we've done all for them we possibly could." I wondered then if we had; and all through these succeeding years, I've been wondering if we are doing all we possibly can for any group of people anywhere, anytime!

Adding emphasis to my problem was an experience just a month ago. Mrs. Powers and I went to our parish church to witness the production of Christopher Fry's "A Sleep of Prisoners." Mr. Fry wrote this particular play with the intent to revive the old affinity between the church and the theater; and his new "morality play" is intended for production before the high altars of modern churches. We entered the church through the side door; and immediately within, were walking on the litter which had fallen as various properties had been carried inside! From the balcony — where the cheaper seats had been for sale — we looked toward the altar. From the head of the aisle, up the steps, and to the very foot of the altar, lay the debris such as you might expect to find in any stable used for housing prisoners of war! Typical old hammered-together bunks stood astride the communion rail, and between the pulpit and lectern stands, and backed against the choir stalls! Hanging just any-old-where, were the filthy-dirty blankets, and the inevitable mattress covers to be filled by each prisoner for himself out of the hay and straw littering the sanctuary!

What sacrilege was this — that so famed and sacred a place should thus be degraded and abused!

The lights lowered; and the first lines were spoken. Clearly this was no ordinary play; and the mood was right for most any dream after the last of these raggedy prisoners miserably tucked himself in. Then the dreams — first that of Adam:

Before us on the stone floor, the brothers Cain and Abel "gambling" for the earth they commonly possessed. Adam, in the back-stage admiringly watched his sons "at play" until in anger over the loss of his possessions to the less-vigorous brother, Cain slew his brother! One almost wept with Adam as he pleaded for the companionship of his departed Eve in that hour of his stark tragedy, ". . . was it for this we gave them birth?"

* * * * * The scenes are changed, and in soul and kingdom, by the rebellious Absalom, commanding his Captain-of-the-Host, Joab, to vanquish the rebellion in any way it might be necessary, ". . . only, do not harm the boy." Joab, schooled and disciplined in an art that can admit no distinction between sin and the sinner, goes out to battle, and returns bearing on his shoulders the body of the dead boy. David seeing them afar off, asks, ". . . what bring you there?" To which Joab makes answer, "This is the victory!" And David cries out, "O Absalom, Absalom! My son, my son!"

* * * * * The scenes are changed, and we drag our reluctant feet up the mountain with Abraham, and sense the steely agony with which his muscles tensed as the dagger is raised and poised to make the sacrifice of his beloved Isaac; and the tension breaks as there in the fence is caught the "substitute"

by which the boy is freed, and a father's heart saved from breaking!

* * * * * And once again the scene is changed. Three young men, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, are thrust into the fiery furnace, hands bound and feet,— Bound as all men's are with the shackles of meaningless traditions and senseless rituals; bound, yet freed in the refining fires as the pure gold of truth and righteousness and justice stand revealed from out the maze of the past. Almost we see the generations of the countless futures arising on the horizons and moving forward into the untrammeled safety of the morally and spiritually disciplined freedoms that belong to men as children of God, and common brothers of all men everywhere . . . "If only we had listened . . . and heard!"

* * * * * The lights went out, and came again to focus, not on the stage; but on the wood-carved reredos of First Church. There the Christ, near life-sized, hand outstretched did bless us, and we knew Him to be ". . . the way, the truth, the life." That is, we know—some of us did. Over and over again was heard another refrain, "I don't know what it was all about;" "I couldn't understand it;" "Is all that in the Bible?" Or as one young high school sophomore put it, "I didn't get a thing out of it, I didn't understand a bit of it."

. . . . Surely, if we have been doing all we can for the people of our generation, no such confusion or spiritual illiteracy as is here indicated could possibly be! If ours is the obligation to "teach the young," surely we must understand the nature of our problem, and devise ways of meeting it. We cannot "share" the Living Word without knowledge of it. That is axiomatic. We cannot "share" it without knowing the object of its sharing, and of the subject with whom we are to share it. That, too, seems axiomatic; but needs to be stated in considerable detail.

Our Heritage

We bring to our modern teaching situations considerable baggage—some of it "excess" no doubt—from the historic past; and for our Protestant positions, those herit-

ages come notably from two streams of theological thought.

1. We inherit much concerning our ideas of the nature of man and his destiny, from the Renaissance. At the risk of oversimplification, I mention only three aspects of that teaching:

a. The idea of self-fulfillment. The revival of learning brought to renewed interest the essential dignity of man, and exalted his potentialities as a child of nature to the point where he was capable of infinite development or self-realization. Moreover, he was to enjoy himself while advancing himself in the directions of perfection; and given the natural sciences and the wisdom to control the forces of nature, there seemed no likelihood but that the reign of love and brotherhood awaited only the hour of its arriving.

b. However, there was an ever-recurrent factor, both in personal and social life,—the continuing struggle between the desires for goodness, and the manifestations of evil attending human behavior. This was not, so the Renaissance doctrinaires said, so much a limitation as it was a veritable principle within history whereby the stream of events served to purify themselves. That is, give the natural processes of history time enough—give evolution its chance—and all errors both personal and social will be cleaned, i.e., an inner "enlightenment" will work to transform the evils of the natural world, and eventually, only good will prevail.

c. This led straight to the conclusion that history means inevitable progress. If the course of evolution is necessarily onward and upward, the chief end of man would be to live long enough to enjoy the ultimately perfect order.

This attitude, handed down from the period of the Renaissance, is most important to us in Christian education, because it seems to say to us that conformity to nature is the way of personal and social salvation. The purposes of education are, therefore, to teach the processes of natural law and how to exercise control of them, and make them to issue in lives and institutions according to the natural and universal order. God was

included in the evolutionary process as Design and Designer; and operated through his natural laws to make possible the ultimate perfection of his own design. Obedience to natural laws was the way to the fulfillment of human destiny: self-fulfillment according to the divine pattern.

2. Almost at the polar extreme to the above, is the teaching handed down from the Reformers. They, too—and necessarily—had a doctrine of man and his destiny.

a. Man was, above all things else, desperately wicked and a sinner beyond all imaginings. One suspects that it was the fashion to magnify sin in order to glorify the Savior! Thus does the word "grace" come into common parlance. Man has not an iota of moral health, and his only hope is in God. Not unless, nor until, God becomes so minded will He deign to grant his redeeming powers; and then, it will be limited to the personal and moral regeneration of the individual.

b. This is important, because sinful man could not be expected to escape from his own pride and egotism as these are manifested in the institutions he created. The Church—as over against the Roman Catholic doctrine of a divine order—is man-made, therefore, in need of penitence and forgiveness from Above. The State cannot be of authority so long as it rises from within the will of a people; but only as kings are established by divine right, do they exercise temporal authority.

c. Whence then comes authority? From God, and that through direct revelation; which revelation has been given to holy men of old, and handed down to the Church in the Bible. Scriptural holiness became the norm of salvation for man and society; and since by definition, moral perfection was impossible, salvation was solely within the gift of divine grace, not to be won through any merit, but through faith alone in the merits and substitutionary death of Jesus Christ upon the Cross. The establishment of the Kingdom of God in history was not possible—man was incapable of the necessary moral behavior thereto; hence, its coming as well as its form and location awaited on

the will of God. Man's destiny, was thus bound up with the will of God, and dependent upon this resolution of time and history.

This inheritance from the Reformers is important to us in Christian education because it seems to deny the dignity of man or credit him with any spiritual aspirations, or moral integrities whatsoever. He is dependent upon a God, "wholly other," who may according to his own will and purpose choose to grant him the gifts of grace whereby he becomes a child of God, and thus give him hope for the future. All man can do, under this doctrine, is penitently "study the Word" that he may be prepared should God in his wisdom, grant him the faith unto salvation. Religious education, therefore, meant such a knowledge of the scriptures as should make one wise unto salvation.

3. It is obvious that there is much contradiction between these two points of view. One may say that they represent the polar extremities of the liberal and the orthodox views of human nature: on the one side, one must lift oneself by his own educational boot-straps—it is almost that God is not needed even as Designer; and on the other side, the moral struggle is next to useless, because one is utterly dependent on the good favor of God to vouchsafe unto him "saving faith,"—it is almost that God can be capricious in His redemptive work of the Holy Spirit.

Crucial Question

Which brings us to the crucial question for modern Christian education: how do we think of man and his destiny; and how can we work to advance the coming of His Kingdom? Again, at the risk of over-simplification, let me suggest that currently Christian educators in the liberal tradition think of human nature as basically neither good nor evil, but bearing potentialities for infinite development in the direction of either. He is a free spirit, gifted with the powers of moral knowledge and experience, and can learn to evaluate his experiences in terms of their moral excellence, and base his decisions and conduct on those

evaluations. We think of him as a "citizen of two kingdoms, and candidate for eternal life" by which we mean he is created a moral being, resident in an earthly kingdom of moral experience, yet also resident in a spiritual kingdom wherein dwelleth righteousness; and as he grows from infancy bodily, mentally and spiritually, he matures to a full-statured man in Jesus Christ. Parenthetically, we may say that it is this "earthly" *vs* "heavenly" tension that is at once the hope and the despair of the modern Christian. On the "earthly" side, we are hedged in on so many sides by conflicting and selfish attitudes and drives, that we are under constant temptation to accede to a prudential ethics. But by teaching, and faith, and experience we learn the "heavenly" way of righteousness, of holiness, of justice, peace and love: aware of these, and sensitized by the Christian gospel in the person and teachings of Jesus, we acknowledge that obedience to His highest is for the Christian not an optional matter,—he is under the mandate of spiritual law: to love God with all the heart, the soul, the mind, and the strength; and one's neighbor as oneself; in brief, to love as Christ has loved us!

The Basic Theme

Let us turn now to the theme specifically assigned and see what it means to us in the light of the above.

1. There is a new attitude toward the Bible. It is the source book concerning those convictions which order both faith and practice for Christians. The Bible faithfully presents the stories of God's revelations in history. Thus the reality and truth about God and man in interrelation are uniquely present in the Scriptures; and a new insight and appreciation is offered as to the value of human experience as a medium of divine revelation.

When I began to teach in the Sunday church school, we were following the method of memorization, interpretation and application,—with great premium on the ability to commit to memory great quantities of selected passages. But apart from definite meanings in terms of actual experiences, we found that the mere learning failed of great

achievement. Hence, we moved over to the "life-situation" method, and hunted for texts and passages that helped us to solve our real or imagined situations. Now, we are increasingly coming to regard the Bible as the story of man's experience seen from God's point of view. We appreciate the level of moral experience from which men historically interpreted their personal and their social lives; and have the added advantage of the evaluations made through the many centuries of Christian history as offering valid data by which to measure life and conduct in our times. We are finding in the Bible, as we find it nowhere else, the best and most adequate interpretation and answer to the problems of humanity. And we sense the obligation to know it thoroughly in order that we may teach it adequately, that it may get the wings of faith for those who come before us to be taught.

2. Alongside this new appreciation of the Bible, is an increasing appreciation of the value of the home as an opportunity for Christian education. Out of a week of some 168 hours, we have naively thought that one hour should be obligated to the church school and as such be sufficient to teach the Christian faith and way. But the conception of learning-by-doing protests that Christian faith and conduct practiced about the family hearth is Christian teaching supreme. The core of the Christian Church is the spiritual fellowship engendered within the organism, which becomes at once the laboratory of Christian experience, and the security within which members find their joy and peace. Many years ago, I heard a college president deliver a series of Church Conference lectures on the theme "This Family World: . . . with God as Father; . . . with Men as Brothers . . . with Jesus Christ at the Hearthstone." He was talking about the Fellowship of the Home and the Church in the Christian way!

3. Then there is a revival of interest in the Church. Someone has pointed out that the only institution that came through the second World War with meaning and significance enhanced was the Church, and that the formation of the World Council at Amster-

dam, signalized this triumphant spiritual note. When I was in seminary, it was fashionable to write critiques of the Church as the scandal of Christianity, the betrayer of its faith, the denier of its vision! Not so now! It is the organism for the propagation of the Christian faith through its program of worship, study, recreation, fellowship and service; and the most proper place for the investment of one's talents in the divine stewardship of the gospel.

4. Again, the old battleground between evangelism and education is being forsaken as both evangelists and educators understand each other, and how their labors supplement rather than hinder one another. A short time ago, the commissions on evangelism, and the commissions on education from eight conferences in three states sat down together to plan a "work camp in educational evangelism" for the young people of that territory. Education prepares the ground and sows the seed; evangelism makes the harvest in terms of lives ready and committed to serve Christ and the Church. And

the two join hands again as they set up programs of education and evangelism to set the new "converts" to work in useful and effective witness to their Savior.

5. Yet once again there is a recovery of the ancient emphasis upon "witnessing" to the life-giving power of Jesus Christ. I have said repeatedly that if there is a missing note in the modern teaching it is the experiential one. By that I mean that just as "preaching is truth through personality," so also is teaching. We may have ever so many curricular materials; lessons in abundance, an understanding of the Scriptures even; if we lack the warm and sympathetic heart set aglow by the fires of the love of Christ, our teaching will be professional, and technical, letter-proof—but joyless and inadequate to teacher and pupil alike. Those who come before us in the teaching situation have the right to know first-hand concerning our own spiritual health. Does thy soul prosper? Then let the pupils know, and learn how and why! Thus the Word of Life—Share It!

TEN MILLION AMBASSADORS

To date over ten million CARE packages have been sent overseas by Americans. Each one of these packages is a person-to-person ambassador of hope and freedom. It is impossible to live in the United States and know what a simple and inadequate diet most Europeans and Asiatics live on. Send another CARE package overseas today!

Published as a public service
in cooperation with
The Advertising Council

IV

THE WORD OF LIFE --

Live It

REUBEN H. MUELLER

Executive Secretary of Christian Education, The Evangelical United Brethren Church, Dayton, Ohio

THE SUBJECT assigned to me makes use of one of the most popular titles given to the Bible. It is particularly appropriate in connection with the special emphasis I am to make as a part of this series on the Bible. I believe that the basic value of the Bible today lies not in what we say or learn *about* the Bible, but rather in whether the spiritual vitality of the Bible *gets into our lives* so that we live out its truth in our own personal experience. I recognize, of course, that understanding how we got our Bible, its history and the proper knowledge of its meaning as the result of the best textual and historical interpretation — all are essential to the intelligent commitment of personal life to the truth and power revealed in it. But here I am trying to emphasize the proposition that all of these other things are preparatory and that anyone who stops with these fails to discover the basic values for right living to be found in the Bible. Therefore I call attention to the fact that our theme contains a vital challenge for the present: "The Word of Life—Live it!" In other words, translate the vital truth in the Word of God into daily personal and social experience.

I. Many People Keep From Living It

In spite of the claim that this is basic, honest evaluation of facts requires that we say that many people keep from living out the truth of the Bible. These are not all outside the church. Many of them are in the church and are among those that claim to believe the Bible to be the Word of God. But they seem not to have any real comprehension of what it means to live it. Others, outside the church, do not regard this volume as having the values that would merit an effort to practice its contents. And between these two extremes are many degrees of attitude and practice. An examination of

some of the reasons for not living the Bible is in point here.

1. First, I call attention to those who idolize the Bible but who rarely catch its real meaning and make little effort to live it. Among these are those who "believe it from cover to cover"; who hold it to be absolutely necessary as a rule of life; and who can speak warmly about it as the Holy Word of God. There is no intent here to reflect on their sincerity. Instead, we point out the tragedy of such bibliolatry, which worships the outward form of the Book, making a fetish or a charm of it, and often regarding it on a very superstitious basis. Sometimes such persons, as they face important issues in life, find it necessary to make practical decisions and think that they seek divine guidance by offering a prayer and then opening the Bible at random, taking the passage upon which the eye first rests as offering the solution they seek, whether it is relevant or not. If it is not, then the passage is allegorized or interpreted in some manner to fit the situation. It is almost in a category with reading fortunes in tea leaves or by means of a deck of cards. Or it may be used as a charm — as in the case of the soldier in battle who carried a Bible in his tunic pocket over his heart that saved his life when the enemy bullet struck the Bible. So he selected the passage on which the point of the bullet rested, as indicating the divine direction for the remainder of his life. How much different is this from carrying a rabbit's foot in the pocket?
2. A particularly common outgrowth of this attitude toward the Bible has been the use of the "proof-text" method of

arriving at divinely revealed truth or of finding scriptural support for one's beliefs. It is to be found in the technique of cross-referencing the Bible where the relevancy of passages is made to rest upon verbal agreement rather than upon the context of the situations out of which they grew. It is rather amazing to discover the extent to which even intelligent people go in the use of this method. One authority quotes a piece of research which sought to establish a list of authoritative character traits from the Bible by listing all its nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs and then classifying them into statements of Christian virtues, and then proceeding to build an entire system of religious education upon them.

Another evidence of this point of view is the use of Scriptural proof texts to support a multiplicity of sects and cults, each with its own peculiar emphases which are the product of such manipulations. As examples—Jehovah's Witnesses, Unity, Christian Science, etc.—each quoting proof texts galore—and each coming out at a different place. But even more tragic are the people in our churches who claim to believe the Bible, who become the easy prey of the Bible-quoting missionaries of these sects, because they themselves are not equipped to deal with these teachings because they do not know what is in the Bible.

This peculiar brand of reverence has also shown itself on the part of many otherwise intelligent Christians in a feeling that the mere reading of the Bible, irrespective of the content or relevancy of that which is read, "does them good" by imparting some spiritual quality to their life or giving them some special accession of spiritual power. Trials are more easily borne, temptations are more effectively faced with the magical power that flows from the Word. There is, of course, a value in the plain reading of the Scriptures, when they are read as intelligently and consecutively as are other books, and, according to my personal belief, more value because of

a special revelation in the Bible, but I am speaking out here against an unintelligent and blind use of Scriptural portions as magical potions for solving all of life's problems.

3. In the next place, I call attention to the viewpoint that considers the Bible to be without special values for living, and that consequently evaluates it with all other literature. This makes it simply a human product. Its values are all relative. There is no absolute standard of truth or guide for experience in it. This attitudes toward the Bible spread rapidly among those who followed the critical and textual study of the books that compose it, but who became engrossed with their own methodology and lost all sense of the divine authority. A leading exponent of this position wrote: "Among educated people, the Bible is more and more becoming an unread book."

This hardly seems like an intelligent position for a truly educated person to take. How can anyone form an intelligent judgment concerning any book that he has never read? In far too many instances, this kind of "absent treatment" is exactly what pseudo-educated people are giving the Scriptures. And, conversely, the truly cultured people in almost every walk of life and kind of service, whether practicing Christians or not, are conversant with the contents of the books of the Bible.

4. Which leads to the fourth reason for the failure of so many people to live according to the Book of Life; namely, ignorance of its content. Let us call this spiritual illiteracy. It is prevalent, first of all, among people who have never become acquainted with the Bible. A generation or two of children and young people grew up in America to whom the Bible is a remote, unknown and unimportant book. In a study of the attitudes of high school young people toward the Bible, made a few years ago in a great metropolitan city, it was disclosed that the number of young people who said

that they did not read the Bible, or that they never discussed it or heard it discussed, and that they had no problems with regard to it, was astonishingly large. Such situations have not improved except in communities where definite programs of instruction were inaugurated that gave specific teaching in the Bible.

But, in the next place, even when such instruction is given, or where persons have had the benefit of traditional teaching through the churches, the spiritual illiteracy rate is also high because so much of what is taught is *about* the Bible, rather than the teaching of the *content* of the Bible. Not that we do not need all the knowledge *about* it that we can possibly get, but why learn *about* it if we are not going to read it and understand it and use it? Furthermore, far too many who are in the Church and who claim to know Christian truth and experience, have a disjointed and fragmentary and often contradictory understanding of what the Bible contains. I am reminded here of a Sunday school teacher in one of my pastorates—a woman past 50 years of age and teacher of a high school girls' class—who seemed to believe that Saul, King of Israel and Saul of Tarsus were one and the same person.

All of which leads me to say that these four, and other reasons, why the Bible is not a book of Life to many people today, need to be gotten out of the way. This cannot be done by legislation or through dictum. The first requisite is that the Bible must be understood. To be understood it must be read. But when read with the understanding and with reverence it will become the guide into life with God. We need to go beyond reading to living. They cannot be separated, however. Therefore, it is of unusual importance to us today that a new version of the Bible is about to be given to the people so that, in their own language, they can read it and understand it—and live it!

II. *Does the Bible Have an Authority for Life?*

But if we are to live the Bible, if it is to have such spiritual values for us, then surely it must be for other reasons than the mistaken viewpoints we have already discussed. There must be an authority in this Book that warrants giving it such a high position of guidance for personal and social right living. Does the Bible have an authority for serving as the guide and standard for living? I believe it does, and for several reasons.

1. It is a Book of life in that it came out of life itself. It was born in experience. It is the record of the spiritual experience of men and women who in successive generations participated in what Emil Brunner called the "divine-human encounter," in which men sought to find God and God made Himself known to man in self-revelation through Jesus Christ. The Bible, that is, the record itself, grew out of the life of humanity in this continuing experience. It records the changing and trying situations which successive generations faced. It reveals the struggles through which they passed and the outcomes at which they arrived. It records the growth and refinement of spiritual insights, religious concepts and ways for gaining the ends of spiritual living. By this I do not mean that it is only a historical record. It is more than that. It is the record of experience—the deposits of many experiences in real situations—each containing the guidance, or some part of it, that points the way to fellowship with God and right living in that fellowship.
2. Which leads to the proposition that this Book offers life-centered values. Not mere theories. Not fantasies. Not imaginary stories. Not artificial or manufactured life situations. For this reason it is hard to understand why the devotees of "life-situation education" turn so seldom to the Bible for their curricular materials, even in their religious education programs. Here is the real Book of Life, giving the record of the search of living men and women for

comradeship with the Giver of all Life. In the words of a well-known Christian educator: "It is a series of deposits of the experience of people who viewed the events of their life in terms of the relation of those events to those fundamental and comprehending values which constitute the ground of all religious life. Every fragment of the Bible, both in the Old and New Testaments, is a precipitate of experience. These fragments record the thoughts, the attitudes and behavior of the then members of the (religious) movement in the presence of very concrete and very specific (personal and) social situations. These deposits are the sources which the historian uses in reconstructing the history of the movement. But the history which results from the use of these sources is a very different thing from what we have in our Bible." He goes on to say, "the Bible, has given us a vast fund of experience to help us to discover the religious possibilities of our world. The deep of the experience of the past calls across the centuries to the deep of our own experience . . . The function of this cumulative experience is to help us better to interpret our own situations, to analyze them for their factors and possibilities and to execute purposes concerning them that will further the fulfillment of life on its higher spiritual levels."

3. Which, reduced to common parlance, means to me that this Book offers guidance for our own life situations. The "fundamental and comprehensive values which constitute the ground of all religious life" are the spiritual principles that are inherent in the very essence of right living. They are in life because God, the Author of all life, created it that way. These principles are not dependent on changing historical, climatic, scientific, social or other conditions. They are operative under any and all conditions. They are God's will for existence; they constitute the essence of God's law or rule for living; they are part and parcel of His Kingdom; that is, His reign

or dominion. They may not be fully understood by men and women at any particular point of time or experience, but they are there—reliable and dependable. They are best illustrated by the Ten Commandments, the Beatitudes, the Golden Rule and the supreme law of love. These, and other evidences of these principles at work, deal with man's relationship to God and man's relationship to man, and the inter-relationship of these two relationships in the spiritual community. They are not detailed codes of laws or rules, that man can memorize and then endeavor to keep. For codes are man's interpretations again, and these change according to circumstances and times. But the basic principles do not change. That is why they are in the Bible. They are true and dependable. All experience proves it. They are not true because they are in the Bible. No—they are in the Bible because they are tried and true.

4. Which persuades me to say that, therefore, the real authority of the Bible is based on more than human experience in its quest after God—but also on God's quest after man—God's self-revelation of Himself which found its supreme expression in Jesus Christ, even as the Bible declares. God was expressing Himself through the Ten Principles long before they were codified through Moses. The law of love was operative long before Jesus expressed it in human words in the day of His flesh. St. Paul was referring to this kind of revelation when he wrote to the Romans, "For what can be known about God is plain to them because God has shown it to them. Ever since the creation of the world His invisible nature; namely, His eternal power and deity, has been clearly perceived in the things that have been made."

But there are those who claim that the Bible has no authority of this kind—that its experimental authority is like that of Browning, Tennyson, Shakespeare or T. S. Eliot. With this I cannot agree.

For to me the Bible has a unity or a oneness that gathers about a person and is not dependent upon a system. For the oneness of the Bible is not the unity of an ecclesiastical system or a system of dogma, nor a system of ritual. The oneness of the Bible rests in the oneness of a person. That person is the living Christ. It is not the oneness of an encyclopedia but the oneness of a personality. The unity of this record, even though spread over 1600 years in time of writing, rests upon the unity of the living Word; the Bible is one book because its master theme is Christ; because the presence of Christ pervades the book as the life of a tree pervades its branches. Every book and prophecy and type and symbol and gospel and epistle fits it like a mosaic. It is like a tapestry. The design is one. So striking is this that it can only be accounted for as the evidence of the presence of One who is bent on revealing Himself and His will for human life to all men.

III. *There Is Need for the Recovery of This Book of Life*

So I come to my conclusion. Such a Book of Life, coming out of living experience, giving guidance in how to come into fellowship with God, having such practical value for present-day living by abiding principles—such a Book ought to be recovered in our time. Even in this regard we have guiding experience in the Bible, in the record of reformation and spiritual recovery under good King Josiah of Judah.

In our times we have tried to live pretty much without its guidance. We have relied upon man's wisdom, independent of this Book. As a result we have worshipped our own intellects, have deified science, have produced frankenstein monsters and, in our confusion, are trying to commit world-wide suicide through wars. By neglecting this Book and its principles we have drifted into

a moral breakdown, until Bible-quoting public officials, who were sworn into office on the solemn authority of God as revealed in the Bible, have had no conscience about mink coats, deep freezes, airplane sales and other forms of unethical persuasion or immoral influence. It has now become so bad that even those officials are crying for a revival of living religion—for a recovery of Christian morals as standards of action for human relationships.

With this desire we certainly agree. But, let us point out that morals always root in religion. Low religious concepts and beliefs produce low morals. High spiritual concepts and faith produce high ethical principles and more actions. All history illustrates this. Egypt, Assyria, Persia, Greece, Rome, France under Bonaparte and in the revolution, Germany under Hitler—and now Russia under Stalin. Every one of these illustrates this principle. Therefore, if we are to have a moral reformation in our time, we will need to have a recovery of the foundations that are spiritual. These are to be found in the Biblical record. Therefore, we need a great revival of Bible reading, for we must read it first, if we are to understand it, and if its message is to find entrance into our lives.

It has happened before. This explains much of the Reformation. The publication of the King James Version of the Bible, making its message available to the common man, opened the way for the moral regeneration of England and the English-speaking world, even as Luther's translation of the Bible into German in an earlier day had done the same for his people. And there are some evidences today that there is a growing new interest everywhere in things spiritual. Let us hope and pray that the publication of the Revised Standard Version this year will greatly contribute to a new reformation in our time and so to the recovery of spiritual power in life through the living Word as revealed in the Book of Life.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Early Church and the New Testament. By IRENE ALLEN. New York: Longmans, Green & Company, 1951. xii + 263 pages. \$2.00.

This excellent little "general Introduction to the New Testament" was written primarily for use in the grammar schools and training colleges of England. In the United States it could be used to very good purpose in colleges or for teachers' training courses in church schools. It may serve as a very worthwhile "refresher" text for busy ministers.

Irene Allen gives evidence of a wide knowledge of New Testament scholarship. Since authorities seem to be in agreement that the New Testament may best be understood as a response to the needs of the early Christian church, this text is written from that viewpoint.

The book is divided into two parts. The first gives a thorough and careful picture of "The World to Which Christ Came." The political, religious, philosophical and social ideas of the first century world are concisely presented and examined. The second division of the text deals with "The Christian Witness," beginning with a study of St. Paul and the early church. This very natural chronological approach to the New Testament is very commendable. The story of the "Christian Witness" continues with the Synoptic Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Johannine Literature, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Pastoral and General Epistles, the Book of Revelation and a final section on the concept of the Kingdom of God.

The author writes carefully and well. In a lucid style and with sincere honesty, the picture of the emergence of the Christian faith, as it is revealed through the New Testament, is presented in a truly graphic manner.

Irene Allen reveals in the text a somewhat British frame of reference. The excellent bibliography is heavily weighted with works by British scholars. At times casual references in the book will make greater appeal to the students of Great Britain than to those of the United States. This does not, however, detract from the value of the book. It is clearly written, thoughtfully oriented as an "introductory text," and it reveals the hand of a sincere Christian witness. —Eugene H. Barib, Professor of Religion, Albright College, Reading, Pa.

* * *

Rediscovering the Bible. By BERNHARD W. ANDERSON. New York: Association Press, 1951. xiii + 272 pages. \$3.50.

This reviewer is probably not the person to make the most appreciative review of this book, for he happens to be one of those who, according to Professor Anderson, is too much under the influence of the modern world-view (p. 14) and so much a "prosaic literalist" that he cannot see how Jesus can be both the Son of Joseph and the Son of the Virgin Mary. Even so he cannot but express great appreciation for the way in which the author presents "the unfolding drama of God's dealings with men" as presented in the

Bible. One reading the book cannot but return to the Bible with greater understanding.

The author presents the material in the Bible in the framework of a three act drama with a prologue and an epilogue. The Prologue tells the story of the beginning of history and continues through the Egyptian sojourn. Act I opens with the events surrounding the Exodus and continues to the time when the Babylonian army, according to the Bible, executes the judgment of God upon Israel. Act II presents first the gloom and despair of the Babylonian exile. Then the scene shifts back to Palestine where the chosen people fail to sense their world mission and become a holy Jewish community walled off from the rest of the world by legalistic Judaism. Act III begins with "the appearance of John the Baptist who summons complacent and self-righteous Jews to repentance and announces the coming of God's long awaited Messiah" (p. 236). The climax comes as God raises Jesus from the dead and the disciples take the gospel message to the world. The Epilogue is the Revelation of St. John which, according to the author, presents an imaginative description of the Last Judgment and the New Creation.

The presentation of the "unfolding drama of God's dealing with men," as the author views the Bible as presenting it, has much to commend it as a basis for understanding Bible religion. It moves forward on the basis of a critical approach to the biblical material and, in the main, the author makes a good case for his major contentions as to the nature of Bible religion. There are weaknesses, of course, as where he suggests that the Eighth Century prophets were not fundamentally concerned about justice and righteousness, but with Israel's pride and sense of self-sufficiency (pp. 100 ff.). And he makes a very selective use of biblical material when he insists that the only biblical view of God is a completely transcendental one. The same selectivity is present in the insistence that the only biblical view of man is that he is a sinner and in the insistence that "the New Age toward which the prophets pointed could not be ushered in by man's efforts" (p. 119). If he had said, by man's efforts alone, he would have been on sounder ground. Certainly, the prophets believed that man had, at least, to repent and yield to God's Will.

The book is weakest at the points where the author seeks to justify the validity of biblical religion. This is attempted in the framework of neo-orthodoxy and involves acceptance, on faith, of the Bible as the Word of God, and as the authority for religion. To get away from the most glaring difficulties involved in this position it is maintained that the Bible is not, in its entirety, the Word of God, but that it contains the Word of God. To escape from others, such as many of the Genesis stories, the "myth" concept is introduced. Such stories, it is held, were never intended to be factual. This is an assumption, which, as this reviewer sees it, likely involves projecting onto the original writers a modern point of view to protect them from the charge of primitivism.

The miracle problem cannot be avoided by either of these methods. It is recognized as too much a part of the biblical story. As the author says, "according to the Bible the sacred drama moves forward . . . by virtue of divine miracle" (p. 42). This, the author recognizes, is a difficult conclusion for the modern mind to accept. It must be accepted, though, he insists, and the miraculous events must be seen as such through the eyes of faith, even though capable of some scientific explanation (p. 56). So must Jesus be accepted as the God-Man "whose coming was a divine miracle wrought in human history" even though the Gospels present him as both the son of Joseph and born of the Virgin Mary (p. 206); and even though the concept of virgin birth grew out of a misinterpretation of the meaning of the word "virgin" in Isaiah's prophecy (p. 167). It is not, the author maintains, sufficient to recognize these claims as evidence of the high esteem in which Jesus was held by the early Christians. Through faith he must be seen as the God-Man.

The author of this volume is not alone in this insistence that biblical religion is something to be taken on faith. He but reflects the point of view of neo-orthodoxy and fundamentalism. This reviewer cannot but feel that this point of view may have tragic consequences for Christianity. The insistence that religious truth is to be judged valid because the man of faith subjectively sees it to be valid through the eyes of faith leaves no grounds for denying the validity of the "truth" that poisonous snakes should be handled, that insanity is caused by demon possession and other such bizarre points of view which can be derived from a selective approach to the Bible. Moreover, the insistence that religious truth is not to be tested in the same manner as other truth, and that it must be confined to the thought-patterns of a prescientific, dualistic world view will increasingly drive thinking people away from the Christian religion. The trouble with this book, and others written with the same orientation, is not that they do not present biblical religion adequately. It is that in having done so without pointing more clearly the way in which modern man can be Christian without accepting a pre-scientific world view, modern educated man will likely be saying increasingly, "If that be Christianity I will have none of it!" — Myron Taggart Hopper, Professor of Religious Education, The College of the Bible, Lexington, Kentucky.



An Introduction to the New Testament. By RICHARD HEARD. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950. xiii + 268 pages. \$3.00.

The author of this book seeks to state briefly how the New Testament was produced and what its essential religious content is. Part I is introductory. It discusses the main trends in modern critical study of the New Testament, traces the formation of the New Testament canon, and sketches the textual history of these writings. This part, like the following ones, includes brief lists of books in English for further reading.

Heard treats the New Testament books in four groups, and in each group he singles out the main issue that his critical study raises. Part II discusses the origin and content of the Gospels; the main

issue is their historical value. The author writes as a Christian. While he regards as later additions certain portions and items, and stresses the extensive element of interpretation in the Gospel of John, he accepts the substantial content of the tradition as trustworthy. The closing chapter of Part II outlines the life and teaching of Jesus.

Part III deals with Acts, discounts somewhat its historical value, and uses the main content to sketch the origin and development of the church.

Part IV groups together all of the letters. Paul did not write Ephesians; he wrote only brief fragments of the Pastoral Epistles. James, I Peter, and Jude come from the authors traditionally assigned them, but II Peter is a second century work. The Elder who wrote the Gospel and Epistles of John was not the Apostle John. Heard's main concern in this section is to discern the pattern of early Christian preaching and ethical teaching.

Part V takes up the Book of Revelation and the place of apocalyptic in the teaching of Jesus and the New Testament. It is argued that Jesus had little sympathy with this way of thinking, and that while the early church exaggerated this aspect of Christian teaching, the Fourth Gospel pierced through the distorted tradition and set forth truly the spiritual character of the Kingdom Jesus preached.

Many points in this sketch are open to debate. Was the resurrection of Jesus more important for the thinking and aim of Mark than Heard suggests (p. 38)? Could not any ten Jewish men rather than "any twelve Jews" form a synagogue group for worship (cf. p. 153)? Was the Fourth Gospel's stress on the present eternal life rather than the coming Kingdom a recasting of Jesus' teaching rather than a recapture of its original form? A more general criticism is that the book covers so many things that neither the complexity of the literary and historical problems nor the vital richness of the gospel message receives adequate expression. However, given the limits of space, it is a good survey that takes a cautious critical position. — Floyd V. Filsom, Professor of New Testament, McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.



The Psychology of Adolescence. By ALEXANDER L. SCHNEIDERS. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1951. xii + 550 pages. \$4.00.

The author addresses himself primarily to parents and educators; but the problems discussed are of interest to everyone who is concerned with the future of man and of his society. Confronted with a society in flux, with distracting and confusing counsel, how can adolescents be helped to achieve the full realization of the promise that is in them?

To achieve this goal the author does not hesitate to go beyond the province of psychology, beyond the empirical findings. The facts have to be interpreted, explained, and evaluated. Believing that his readers will "lack the background necessary to understand the concepts and principles of adolescent psychology" considerable space is allotted to a theory of human behavior (e.g. three of the four chapters on motivation might fit into a general course in psychology). While he draws upon the general reservoir of available information he does not hesitate to stress or condemn in terms of his

own set of values. And it is possible that Chapter XVI, "Moral and Religious Development During Adolescence," provides the integrating set of values around which the rest of the author's materials are arranged.

Certain omissions are noteworthy. The psychoanalytic view of development is not presented, nor do the names of Freud, Fromm, Horney, Helene Deutsch, Sullivan, Alexander, Kubie, Hendrick, appear in the bibliography (which includes some five hundred or more titles). The data which are presented in the text are drawn primarily from opinion polls and statistical studies rather than from the laboratory or the clinic. Willoughby, Fry, and Landis offer the main support for the argument in the section on psychosexual development. Kinsey is not mentioned.

One also misses the study of concrete cases, a device which helps to make vivid what otherwise remains a verbal generalization. In spite of a stress upon the inter-relatedness of growth, upon character and temperament, and upon the self, these remain abstractions. Frequent comparisons are made between the development of Catholic and non-Catholic youth; and these usually give evidence in support of the thesis that both in home and in school (not to mention church) Catholic training is superior. The author seems to be somewhat ambivalent about education and sees "pernicious educational preachings" at the root of a decay in the character of youth. He sees the full flowering of religious life as essential to the full development of character. Indeed, it is "often the only path to adjustment for the troubled individual." And while Catholic education contributes to the character, health, and welfare of Catholic youth, he cites (p. 364) a study which indicates that these Catholic students tend to be more conservative in their religious attitudes; and he adds "in all tests of intellectual ability, including high school content, university grades, intelligence tests, and other measures, the typical conservative always made the poorer score." Are we in choosing a path to *complete development* to choose one which results in an impairment of the intellect? — L. E. Cole, Professor of Psychology, Oberlin College.



Purim and Hanukkah in Custom and Tradition. By THEODORE H. GASTER. New York: Henry Schuman, Inc., 1950. xvi + 134 pages. \$2.50.

We are indebted to Dr. Theo H. Gaster of Drosdick College and the Henry Schuman Press for another scholarly and fascinating volume in the Great Religious Festival Series. Purim, the feast of Lots and Hanukkah, the festival of lights, have always been two of the most colorful folk festivals on the Jewish calendar. Both speak of the perennial theme of national liberation and individual and group freedom. In both Israel and the Diaspora these holidays are celebrated in home, synagogue and community with ceremonies and observances, appealing to both young and old. Dr. Gaster's informing study brings to us the many fascinating aspects of these holidays in history, legend and contemporary Jewish practices. The most valuable contribution made by this volume lies, however, in the field of comparative religion and historical analysis. Dr. Gaster, in true scholarly fashion, traces the relationship of these uniquely Jewish observances to some of the ancient and

primitive festivals in the Persian, Greek and Babylonian world.

Purim, according to one theory, is associated with the ancient Babylonian New Year festival. It displays many similarities, likewise, to the Persian Farwadigan or five day All Souls' festival. The Esther story, our author further indicates, has many points of resemblance to New Year rites in many parts of the world. Such celebrations were frequently marked by the selection of a queen and are reminiscent of the Queen Esther theme in the Biblical account. In modern Arabic, Dr. Gaster reminds us, the New Year is still called "Phur," a word bearing close resemblance to the Hebrew "Pur" (translated "lot") in the Purim story. The Book of Esther, we are further told, was not originally composed as the story of Purim, but came to serve that purpose later as a result of a combination of two famous Persian tales — those of Vashti and Esther. Recast in a Jewish form, these ancient Persian Novella have become the framework of this delightful Jewish holiday.

Hanukkah, although rooted more securely in actual historical incidents, also bears traces in its observances of the winter solstice holidays and the carrying of torches as practiced in the ancient Greek festival of rural Dionysia. The eight day celebration, Dr. Gaster points out, has many affinities, likewise, with the Biblical festival of Booths and the revival of an old Biblical custom of purifying the Temple.

Whatever their historical antecedents, both Purim and Hanukkah are today distinctively Jewish festivals. Their unique customs, ceremonies and folklore, as described in this volume, will be of especial interest to both Jewish and Christian leaders. — Harry Kaplan, Director, B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation, Ohio State University.



Games for Grownups. By MARGUERITE KOHN and FREDERICA YOUNG. New York: A. A. Wyn, Inc., 1951. xv + 176 pages. \$2.50.

This book fulfills the promise of its jacket advertising very well. It contains "161 games new and old, including old favorites with a new twist." If it is not exactly "the key" to successful home entertaining, it is certainly a very great help. The large majority of the games are old, only 32 of the total above being unfamiliar to this reviewer, but that is in itself no objection; if a game is good it deserves to enjoy a long life, and it must be said that really new good games are very scarce. Usually the "new twists" employed serve to rejuvenate and increase the fun of well-known games, and occasionally they consist only of new names or properties.

One of the best features of the book is the great clarity with which each game is described and explained, a boon to the amateur leader for whom the book is designed. When proverbs are necessary, a list is given; illustrative dialog is often used; possible difficulties are anticipated. A list of one hundred true-false questions will be found especially useful.

The index shows for each game its type — active, quiet, etc. — the preparation required, number of players and time for playing. Charts are also given which classify all the games in the book according to the categories above so that the hurried leader can see at a glance what the possibilities

are for a small group, for instance. All this is very helpful indeed.

The introductory chapter of help for the leader of a home party and the last one, which deals with techniques for handling a large group in a big place, reflect the wide experience of the authors. With wit and spice they give excellent advice for both. Altogether, it seems that this is a valuable book for someone starting a recreation library, or for a seasoned leader needing some new slants on party games.

Since this review is to appear in a magazine for religious educators, it should probably be mentioned that the book does contain a few games and tricks of doubtful taste, notably a trick with a jigger of whiskey and a game called "Horse Race" in which players may place their bets "with money or only slips of paper." — *Katherine Robrbough*, Cooperative Recreation Service, Delaware, Ohio.



College Teaching and Christian Values. Edited by PAUL M. LIMBERT. New York: Association Press, 1951. 187 Pages. \$2.75.

It is wholesome that educators who are Christians are answering the charge of "secularism" in higher education. By now the argument that colleges have succumbed to the non-religious philosophies is familiar to all concerned with religion in our culture. Reasons for this capitulation are not difficult to find. At the same time, intelligent replies consistent with competent scholarship and fundamental Christian understanding will obviously not be numerous. The symposium *College Teaching and Christian Values*, edited by Paul M. Limbert, and written by a group of unusually competent Christian scholars of many fields belongs in the forefront of such replies.

The editor in his summary chapter has distilled the criteria by which a teacher must be governed if he is to be Christian in any field. They are: (sharply condensed)

1. Breed a respect for facts
2. Develop a sense of humility before the data
3. Make ones own assumptions clear
4. Encourage independent thinking

Even before any explicit Christian interpretation is made, the manner in which the religious person as teacher deals with his materials and his students attests to the genuineness of his religion. In his class room contacts, but probably even more outside of them, he interprets the quality and nature of his faith.

Religious work has unfortunately come to mean full time activity in some form of parish ministry. As other professions raised their standards and as public education developed, the role of the ministry has declined as a teaching function. Yet the opportunity for religious teaching is greater in the school than in the church, by virtue of the greater amount of time spent in class and in preparation. Thus college teaching offers a form of ministry of exceptional order. In this presentation nine college teachers, a student religious worker, and a college president give their justification for teaching in their several disciplines as a form of ministry. Their case, individually and collectively, is highly convincing.

But there is a value in this collection of personal interpretations far in excess of the case the au-

thors make for their several disciplines. (This is by no means a competitive series.) If the general reader interested in the curriculum of a university wanted to understand the basis for the contribution of each field, the physical sciences, the social sciences, the humanities, he would find this book a fascinating introduction. In addition, he would receive a religious education in the liberal culture of our times. Individuals sensitive to the decline of religious values and eager for the strengthening of spiritual life on our campuses may well study this total analysis.

If this book were only a candle in the darkness it would be encouraging. But it itself is a part of a rising tide of interest. That colleges and universities have become increasingly aware of the need for such a diagnosis and proposals as are here made is one of the hopeful signs.

In a good symposium, it is unfair to single out individual contributors. Suffice it to say there is rich material in all of the chapters. And the usefulness of this book should extend far beyond professional workers in higher education and religious leaders.—*Victor Oberhaus*, Associate Professor of The Church in Agricultural and Industrial Life, Chicago Theological Seminary.



These Found the Way. Edited by DAVID WESLEY SOPER. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1951. 175 pages. \$2.50.

Dr. Soper, professor of religion at Beloit College, has performed a genuine act of service in editing this volume of personal testimony. Here are the stories of thirteen converts to Protestant Christianity, ranging all the way from such typical cases as Joy Davidman, the novelist and former communist, Joseph Wittkofski, the former Roman priest, Asa G. Candler, capitalist and former alcoholic, Lee Jordan, an ordinary man who struggled with the problem of pain, and Gerald Kennedy, Methodist bishop who had his moments of doubt, and the others who, for one reason or another, found it difficult to believe in God, but who found their way through to the Christian faith as interpreted by the Protestant Church.

When all is said and done, it is the life story of a man that is finally important. The best interpreter of religion is not a book but a teacher; the best demonstration of Christianity is not an argument but a life. That is why this book will be of such value. It presents thirteen case studies, each of them different, of man's struggle with doubt, selfishness and error, in the attempt to find his way through to a confident faith. The Christian community might well absorb one such book a year and it is to be hoped that Dr. Soper will put his hand to another.—*Clarence Seidensticker*, First Methodist Church, Racine, Wisconsin.



Way to Wisdom. By KARL JASPERS. Translated by Ralph Manheim. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951. 208 pages. \$3.00.

Existential thinking has not made a decisive impact upon American religious and philosophical thought. Popular misconceptions of the movement based upon Sartrean eccentricities may be partially responsible for continued American intellectual insularity. Probably a deeper antago-

nism to Existence philosophy stems from the recognition that its insistent call to explore the murky subjective depths of the self reveals a tragic and unique dimension of life which contradicts and defies all the "objective" statistical charts of "typical" personalities ever published. The basic optimistic rationalism of the American philosophical spirit considers absurd that which directs attention to the categories of depth and uniqueness.

Karl Jaspers' *Way to Wisdom*, translated by Ralph Manheim and subtitled "An Introduction to Philosophy," interprets philosophy's task in the Existentialist framework. The book is composed of a series of essays on the perennial issues of philosophy as seen through the necessity of man's understanding of himself as he genuinely is. Jaspers thinks as an existentialist, not as one who stands aloof from the philosophic enterprise pointing others the way to go. He is engaged personally in the outcome of his analysis and explication of the human situation. His writing carries the quality of urgency and fatefulness which opposes the spirit of theoretical, "disinterested" philosophy.

For Jaspers, philosophy is not the private preserve of the professional philosopher. It is an act of living through which we come to the awareness of our meaning in the system of being. Every man has to philosophize for himself; no general system applies. Philosophy arises in wonder, in doubt of knowledge hitherto accepted as certain but perhaps most directly from the sense of forsakenness which drives man to seek a ground of his personal existence in depths beyond those offered by sense experience and immaculate rationalism. The mystery of one's own existence, death, guilt and suffering are indigenous to man's nature and it is mischievous nonsense to suppose that man can carry on philosophy seriously and disregard these factors in his situation.

However, philosophy is no mere wallowing about in the pathos of inwardness. For Jaspers there must be a healthy concern for the world of commonly shared objects and communication with others. "To attempt the communication of every aspect of truth from man to man, in loving contest" and "patiently and unremittingly to sustain the vigilance of reason in the presence of failure and in the presence of that which seems alien to it," is to be faithful to the goals of philosophic discourse (cf. pp. 13-14).

Three appendices conclude the book. The first offers a rewarding soliloquy upon philosophy and science in the course of which the author's observations upon university education are clearly stated. The practical guide to readings in philosophy offered in the second appendix is concrete. However, the list of philosophers recommended is of uneven value. Why Paracelsus and not Berkeley? Why Darwin and not Spencer? Why is there no mention of Whitehead, Bergson or Cassirer? And would it be too much to ask that European students of philosophy read a few American authors, Edwards, Royce, James or Dewey? A bibliography of Jaspers' works is found in the third appendix.

The chapters of this volume originated in a series of addresses delivered by Jaspers on a radio station in Basel. This fact may partly explain the almost cryptic style the author adopts. There is a lack of systematic expansion of ideas which oc-

casionally baffles the reader and the author's tendency to dogmatic assertion and generalization is irritating. The awkward, paradoxical phrases of much Existence philosophy are to be found (e.g. "resolute knowledge in the consummation of non-knowledge," p. 160). Nevertheless, Jaspers gets at the business of philosophy in a refreshing and positive way. He does not even shy away from a discussion of God! One feels the "philosophic life" is still a live option and that to live in the presence of that Other wherein we are at last rooted and to which we return is a worthy end.—*Clyde A. Holbrook, Professor of Religion, Oberlin College.*



A Believing Jew. By MILTON STEINBERG. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company, 1951. 318 pages. \$3.50.

This is a posthumous collection of the writings of Rabbi Milton Steinberg, whose untimely death at the age of forty-six, was widely mourned by his many admirers and followers.

A brilliant writer, author of several books, a superb preacher, and speaker, young beloved Rabbi Steinberg of New York's Park Avenue Synagogue was regarded as one of the most eloquently articulate intellectual spokesmen of the modern American rabbinate. Like in his previous works, *The Making of the Modern Jew*, *A Partisan's Guide to the Jewish Problem* and *Basic Judaism*, in this volume too, his ideas are set forth clearly and honestly.

The material in this book is arranged in four sections. In the first section of the book entitled "The Idea of God," Rabbi Steinberg shows his deep faith and interest in theological problems. He discusses the paradox of evil in a God motivated world, the conflict of faith and reason, the retreat of religion, and human destiny. He points out that there exists a causal relation between belief and behavior; that theological insights are revealed in their true and vital relevance to human welfare. It is obvious—says Rabbi Steinberg in his essay, "The Social Crisis and the Retreat of God"—that "in dealing with the crucial issues of our generation, we shall have to do more than remake political structures, recast economic processes, and reorder educational procedure, indispensable as these tasks may be. . . . One must first make certain affirmations concerning life; hence concerning the universe of which it is a manifestation, therefore, ultimately, concerning God" (p. 55). Believing that "religion is a complex affair answering to a multiplicity of needs of which the direction of human relationships is only one among several" and that "there is more to religion than social justice, important as that may be," Rabbi Steinberg appeals for equilibrium and balance, and protests against "substituting society for God as an object of worship and as the goal of religious activity" ("A Protest against a New Cult") (p. 59).

In the papers of the second section "Judaism and the American Scene," Rabbi Steinberg analyzes the dilemma the American Jew is facing, by living in two civilizations. "At no time am I conscious of strain or incompatibility between the two worlds. I move from one to the other with such naturalness that I am scarcely aware of the change

in spiritual locale. . . . Lincoln and Jefferson are my heroes together with Rabbi Akiba and Moses Maimonides. The four get along in my imagination most companionably." ("A Specimen Jew," p. 99). One is deeply moved, reading in section III—Israel, the touching address, "When I think of Seraye," a town in Lithuania which is a great poetic memorial for the six million Jewish martyrs of the many Serayes, "places of great spiritual earnestness." In another noteworthy sermon on the rebirth of the State of Israel, " Latter Day Miracle: Israel," he points out that its deeper universal significance lies in the fact that the realization of this miracle gives hope for the realizations of man's ideal of God's Kingdom on earth. In the essay, "Pity for the Living," Rabbi Steinberg stresses the idea of compassion as the basic trait in Jewish religion, "that mercy is a sign, not of weakness, as Nietzsche argued, and the Nazis after him, but of strength; that only a healthy soul is capable of pity, and a strong mind of mercy."

The papers of the fourth and last section were written in anticipation of the end of his life journey. Reading his last essay on life and its meaning, was to the reviewer, one of the many who knew and admired Rabbi Steinberg, an experience of deep sadness. "Given God everything becomes more precious, more to be loved and clung to, more embracable; and yet at the same time, easier to give up. . . . All of life is the more treasurable because a great and Holy Spirit is in it. And yet, it is easier for me to let go. For these things are not and never have been mine. They belong to the Universe and the God who stands behind it. True, I have been privileged to enjoy them for an hour but they were always a loan due to be recalled. . . . Life is at once infinitely precious, and yet as a thing lightly to be surrendered. Only because of Him is it made possible for us to clasp the world with relaxed hands; to embrace it, but with open arms."

A Believing Jew is a noble legacy of faith and fortitude by one of America's most brilliant rabbis. By its content, clear thinking and rare literary quality, the reader will find the book stimulating, delightful and inspiring.—Rabbi Bernard Cohen, Director, Hebrew Institute, San Antonio, Texas.

Unused Alibis. Edited by PHILIP HENRY LOTZ. New York: Association Press, 1951. vi + 120 pages. \$2.00.

This is the final volume in the "Creative Personalities Series" of seven books of story biographies published by Association Press. This volume confirms the conviction that live persons and actual achievements make more stimulating reading than one finds in the imagined exploits of fictional characters. Here are sixteen well-written true stories by eleven capable writers. They concern the lives of men and women, well-known and unknown, who have overcome one or more serious handicaps and who refused to use the alibis which were provided for them by injury, illness, physical limitation, and minority discrimination. The book will take its rightful place with others of this series as a resource for good illustrative material for teachers and preachers. Much of its value is its use of contemporary personalities, and in addition, the selection of the so-called "average or typical person" who has demonstrated a courageous and

morally praiseworthy overcoming of weakness or potential defeat. The blind, the maimed, the paralyzed, the redeemed criminal, the victims of racial discrimination, and the multi-handicapped, all march heroically through these pages to inspire and encourage those of us who have not been called to face these misfortunes.

This reviewer recommends reading the book over a period of days rather than at one sitting. By mid-book, in the latter reading method, handicaps become so commonplace that the reader is inclined to feel somewhat apologetic that he does not have some similar handicap to overcome. Moreover, he is inclined to miss the courageous drama in the later stories because of a "more of the same" attitude.

Here is a book highly recommended for personal reading and encouragement, and for use as illustrative resource.—Hoover Rupert, Minister, First Methodist Church, Jackson, Michigan.

* * *

Let's Live! A Program of Conduct. By CLAUDE RICHARDS. New York: Exposition Press, 1951. 206 pages. \$3.00.

The title *Let's Live* indicates the mood of the author who, a business man, enthusiastically believes that anyone can learn to live effectively and joyfully; the subtitle, the scope of the book with its workable suggestions for the every day interests of life. It deals with marriage, child training, work and leisure, spending and saving, intellectual growth, drinking and smoking, friendships, citizenship, the church and spiritual life. One exciting idea is "The Home Evening" a plan described in detail for knitting families together and making the home a center of joy and power. Readable in style and packed with practical common sense, it should be especially helpful to youth and young married couples.—A. R. Grummon, First Methodist Church, Springfield, Ill.

* * *

The Psalms and Their Meaning for Today. By SAMUEL TERRIEN. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1952. 278 pages. \$3.00.

This volume is one of the best of recent books on the Psalms. It is written for the general reader, and would make an excellent text for church school teachers' training classes. It also is of value for the biblical scholar, who will profit from the interpretations and insights of Professor Terrien. The literary quality of the book is itself worthy of mention, for it is simply and beautifully written, worthy of its subject.

The author discusses first the origin of the Psalms, and the main body of the book is an analysis of selected psalms arranged in the following helpful classification: I, Hymns of Praise—(a) worship of the Lord of nature, (b) worship of the Lord of history, (c) worship of the Lord of Zion; II, Prayers in Times of Crisis—(a) national laments, (b) personal supplications, (c) penitential prayers; III, Songs of Faith—(a) psalms of thanksgiving, (b) psalms of trust, (c) psalms of "wisdom" and communion. This is followed by a discussion of the meaning of the psalms for today. An introductory preface gives perspective through a discussion of the Psalms in the life of the western world.

Terrien thus adopts the classification of the

Psalms based on form analysis and the dominant theme of each poem, an approach similar to that of Hermann Gunkel. He finds five dominant motives: (1) deliverance in warfare, (2) cultic presence, (3) harvest thanksgiving, (4) holy history, and (5) personal communion with the divine. He has a keen perception both of the religion and the poetry of the Psalms, and his fresh translations are not only carefully accurate, but the arrangement in couplets or tristichs and in strophes is effectively made. Terrien translates and interprets twenty-eight psalms, as well as parts of other psalms and illustrative materials from other parts of the Bible. He also makes excellent use of illustrations from general literature and the Christian classics. This is a good book.—*Herbert G. May*, Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College.

* * *

Better Living Booklets. By SCIENCE RESEARCH ASSOCIATES, 57 West Grand Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. 1951. 49 pages each. 40c each.

Fears of Children. By Helen Ross.

Helping Children Talk Better. By C. Van Riper. *Your Children's Heredity*. By Bernice L. Neugarten.

Emotional Problems of Growing Up. By O. Spurgeon English, M.D., and Stuart M. Finch, M.D.

Exploring Children's Interests. By G. Frederic Kuder and Blanche B. Paulson.

Self-Understanding—A First Step to Understanding Children. By William C. Menninger, M.D.

The *Better Living Booklets* are unit studies dealing with children's development—their feelings and behavior, their emotional problems and their interests—and are directed to parents and teachers who are concerned with "helping children become more competent and happy adults." Each is written by one or two professionals with practical experience in the fields of child study and counseling. The above six booklets, plus others in the current series, belong in church school libraries used by parents as well as staff, and would be most helpful to young adults just entering parenthood.

Fears of Children presents anxiety, helplessness, of many characteristic types (fears related to hunger, the dark, loneliness, death, bodily hurt, conscience), and the part that love, sincere interest, feelings of security, can play in helping children handle such fears.

Helping Children Talk Better emphasizes the importance of very early babbling and related speech play with children, as well as patient introduction to vocabulary by gestures and associated meanings. Simple exercises are described in detail, along with suggested times to initiate correction. This is one of the most carefully detailed manuals on this subject available.

Your Children's Heredity scientifically explores the possibilities of what children may inherit as individual differences, but stresses the general plasticity of the infant, and points out that hereditary defects can be effectively adjusted to social situations.

Emotional Problems of Growing Up, in psychiat-

ric frame of reference, explores emotional behavior as expressed in the challenges of adolescence (relations with the opposite sex, independence from family, vocation, citizenship). "The mature parent expects no tit-for-tat return on his investment in love, time and energy. His attitude is: 'I give—you take. As you take, you will be learning to give in due time.'" More restrictions are not what is called for in the teens, but greater belief in children's ability to think and act intelligently, and encouragement to them to take on more responsibility. There are many conflicting standards of behavior in our society which this viewpoint does not explore, but it does lay the base for stable exploration of the ever-present problems.

Exploring Children's Interests. Interest comes from exposure to many activities, in given culture areas. In childhood, interest comes through awareness, fostered by directed play activity and encouraging companionship in the here-and-now world. The reader is introduced to standard interest inventories, how they are set up, and their use as guides to study, vocation and leisure interests. They short-cut random trial and error that is not tied to main personality drives. Diverting hobbies are so important. "We seek those who make us feel alive."

Self-Understanding is a rather technical analysis of personality development, but is helpfully summarized in suggested steps to recognizing one's difficulties and gaining emotional maturity—guidelines that stand out from a psychiatrist's wide experience. What kind of adults are we on whom children depend to build their trust in human relationships?—*Beatrice Clemons*, Nashville, Tenn.

* * *

Catholicism and American Freedom. By JAMES M. O'NEILL. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1952. xii + 287 pages. \$3.50.

This is another book that has been produced to support one side of the renewed debate over the relation of Church and State in America. The Founding Fathers thought the issue was settled with the formulation of the First Amendment to the Constitution. They were mistaken.

As new grist for the forensic hopper this book and others like it are important. Our tradition of free discussion invites the fullest debate though it does not always guarantee the character of the evidence of the antagonists. Dr. O'Neill brings to his discussion a certainty that Blanshard, whose *American Freedom and Catholic Power* he is undertaking to answer, is "incompetent" or "dishonest," "vulgar," "a militant secularist," "biased and inaccurate," and guilty of "linguistic absurdities" and "other varieties of nonsense." This may or may not be an aid to clarity in discussion. Dr. O'Neill also is sure that the recent decisions of the U. S. Supreme Court respecting Church and State were mistaken. Mr. Justice Black was guilty of "historical and linguistic errors"; the Rutledge dissenting opinion in the *Everson* case had "little relation to the realities of language, history, biography or law." The essence of the Rutledge doctrine is "nonsense." O'Neill believes that "modern proponents of aggressive secularism" and "the Supreme Court justices" are a part of a "current campaign to amend the Constitution by substituting

the figurative 'wall of separation between Church and State' for the literal language of the First Amendment."

Dr. O'Neill undertakes to document what he says, partly because he is serious and thorough, and partly because he thinks Blanshard's documentation of his thesis is inexact, tendentious, and selective, something O'Neill wants to avoid. Whether he has succeeded will depend on the care with which each reference he makes to Blanshard and his own sources is checked by the reader, and by the bias, if any, which the reader brings to his reading. There will be few to check, and the bias of the rest is fixed. For this reason, despite the vigor of the O'Neill advocacy, it is unlikely that it will win the support he hopes.

Documentation is a problem in every work that calls for it. The author will document what he thinks needs it and leave unsupported what, to him, is either self-evident or of slight importance. Since this is the option of the writer, it cannot satisfy all readers and generally the author knowingly runs this risk. O'Neill distrusts Blanshard and thinks his book is bad. He believes his own book is "fair, informed, and accurate." Obviously in Blanshard, the former are due to "lapses in attitude and workmanship," the latter are due to dear knows what! When he says (p. 255) that "the words 'heathen,' 'pagan,' 'heretic,' 'infidel,' 'schismatic' as used by scholars in the Catholic Church are not instances of name-calling but are objective labels for doctrinal positions or groups of people who have a common philosophy — like Democrat, Republican, dissenter, Covenanter, or Communist," we are at a loss to know what he means by "insults." Blanshard belongs in the general category of insulters.

This is another way of saying that however necessary documentation may be, it is a snare for the writer as well as a delusion for the reader. For example, Dr. O'Neill begins his preface thus: "This book is written in defense of American Catholics." To him this needs no foot-note support. And yet to this reviewer two things within that opening sentence need documentation. Why defense? If the "gates of hell" are not to prevail against the Holy Apostolic Catholic Church, why defend it against pip-squeaks or politicians or pamphleteers? But more seriously, who are "American Catholics"? How do they differ from Roman Catholics? In national origin? In doctrine? In faith and practice? This is important to his study, because while he is answering "only a part of Mr. Blanshard's attack," Mr. B. is "attacking" with "false accusations, misinterpretations and insinuations" not American Catholics but a system of ecclesiastical power centered in Rome. Dr. O'Neill quotes many American Catholics in his defense of them, but he obviously shares Roman Catholic beliefs in papal infallibility and the supremacy of the Roman Catholic Church over all other religious fellowships. This he has a right to do. The point is, however, that if he is quoting Cardinal Gibbons in support of American democ-

racy, should he not quote Pope Pius IX. (*Quanta Cura*, Dec. 8, 1864) who denounced "that pernicious and insane opinion that liberty of conscience and worship is the right of every man, and that this right ought, in every well-governed state, to be proclaimed and asserted by law"; and concluded by saying "the pope neither can or ought to be reconciled with progress, liberalism, and modern civilization"? Then let Dr. O'Neill tell us with whom he agrees. Is there an American Catholic position that is in any important or essential detail different from Roman Catholicism?

This is not to quibble; it is to point up the difficulty Dr. O'Neill has documenting his statements for those who do not already share his position as American Roman Catholics.

Perhaps he should have documented more, perhaps less. The same can be said of Blanshard. At one point I find myself grateful for a clarification of the heresy of "Americanism." It was, in Pope Leo XIII's mind, a group of doctrines that had been given expression in France, not America. It is gratifying to know that the Pope was badly advised, and that it is not really heretical to be an American, though an American Protestant is a heretic.

Obviously this is not a conventional book review. The nature of the O'Neill study would demand cross-checking of references that would be equivalent to the work of another book. Short of this it is not easy to say more than that the author attacks Blanshard's writings — and this requires knowledge on the reader's part of what Blanshard has written — and does so from positions that are, to say the least, equivocal to the non-Catholic mind. He holds to an interpretation of the meaning of the First Amendment which has not yet won the support of the U. S. Supreme Court. The copiously documented (sic) book by Conrad H. Moehlman, *The Wall of Separation between Church and State* (Beacon Press), has criss-crossed O'Neill's interpretation with evidence, historic and legal, that controverts it impressively. I do not know whether O'Neill has read Moehlman or if he has, how insulting, insinuating, dishonest or vulgar he regards the author and/or the book.

It all adds up to something like this: in his review of the O'Neill book in the N. Y. Times, April 13, 1952, Theodore Maynard concludes: "Unless Mr. Blanshard is a centipede, it is not easy to see how, after Mr. O'Neill's reply, he will have a leg to stand on." I am not sure that Dr. Maynard is biased; but I am. And, after reading O'Neill's reply, I am more biased than ever in the direction of thinking that minds as diverse and enterprising as Blanshard's and O'Neill's can never meet. O'Neill's book, like his former one, should be read, but not in the expectation that Roman Catholicism and American freedom will be caught kissing, even though voluminous documentation is presented to prove the naturalness of their impulse to do so. There is a Roman cicerone nearby who does not permit such behavior in public. — *Edwin McNeal Poteat*, Minister, Pullen Memorial Church, Raleigh, N. C.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION STANDING COMMITTEES

CHAIRMEN OF STANDING COMMITTEES

CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE—
Israel S. Chipkin, Jewish Education
Committee, New York 19, N. Y.

FINANCE—Ernest J. Chave, Divinity
School, University of Chicago.

EDITORIAL—Leonard A. Stidley, Graduate
School of Theology, Oberlin College.

HIGHER EDUCATION—Edward W.
Blakeman, Pacific School of Religion,
Berkeley, Calif.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

SAMUEL P. FRANKLIN, University of
Pittsburgh, Chairman.

EARL A. DIMMICK, Superintendent of
Pittsburgh Public Schools, Pittsburgh,
Pa.

SOLOMON B. FREEHOP, Rodef Shalom
Temple, Pittsburgh, Pa.

EMANUEL GAMORAN, Commission on
Jewish Education, Cincinnati.

JOHN L. KNIGHT, President, Baldwin-
Wallace College, Berea, Ohio.

LAWRENCE C. LITTLE, University of
Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

THOMAS J. QUIGLEY, Superintendent of
Roman Catholic Schools, Pittsburgh,
Pa.

LEONARD A. STIDLEY, Graduate School
of Theology, Oberlin College, Ober-
lin, Ohio.

O. M. WALTON, Executive Secretary,
Council of Churches, Pittsburgh, Pa.

PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR THE OBSERVANCE OF THE 50th ANNIVERSARY

F. ERNEST JOHNSON, Central Department
of Research and Survey of the
National Council of Churches of
Christ in the U.S.A., New York City,
Chairman.

EDNA BAXTER, Hartford School of Re-
ligious Education, Hartford, Conn.

ISRAEL S. CHIPKIN, Vice-President for
Research and Experimentation, Jewish
Education Committee of New
York City.

WILLIAM H. CONLEY, Vice-President,
Seaton Hall University College, New-
ark, N. J.

FRANCIS CROWLEY, Dean, School of
Education, Fordham University, New
York City.

GEORGE B. FORD, Pastor, Corpus Christi
Church, New York City.

EMANUEL GAMORAN, Executive Di-
rector, Commission of Jewish Edu-
cation, The Union of American He-
brew Congregations, New York City.

FRANK GREBE, Minister of Education,
Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church,
New York City.

SIMON GREENBERG, Vice Chancellor,
Jewish Theological Seminary of
America, New York City.

HUGH HARTSHORNE, Divinity School,
Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

LEO HONOR, Dropsie College, Phila-
delphia, Penn.

PHILIP JONES, Associate Director,
World Council of Christian Edu-
cation and Sunday School Associations,
New York City.

OSCAR LEE, Director of the Dept. of
Racial and Cultural Relations, Na-
tional Council of Churches of Christ
in the U.S.A., New York City.

PAUL B. MAVES, Drew Theological
Seminary, Madison, N. J.

ERNEST O. MELBY, Dean, School of
Education, New York University.

CYRIL F. MEYER, Brooklyn, New York.

ABRAHAM E. MILLGRAM, Executive Di-
rector, United Synagogue Com-
mission on Jewish Education, New York
City.

LOUIS J. SHERRILL, Union Theological
Seminary, New York City.

GEORGE N. SHUSTER, President, Hunter
College, New York City.

ISRAEL TABAK, Chairman of the Com-
mission on Education of the Rabbini-
cal Council of America, Baltimore,
Md.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

For list of members of this committee see the inside front cover.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

OFFICERS

PRESIDENT — Samuel P. Franklin, Dean, School of Education, University of Pittsburgh.

RECORDING SECRETARY — Imogene M. McPherson, Director, Weekday and Vacation Church Schools, Protestant Council of the City of New York.

VICE-PRESIDENTS — Ruth M. Shriver, Church of Brethren, Elgin, Illinois, Emanuel Gamoran, Commission on Jewish Education, New York, City, and Thomas J. Quigley, Superintendent of Roman Catholic Schools, Pittsburgh, Pa.

TREASURER — R. Merrill Powers, 77 W. Washington, Chicago, Ill.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Edna L. Acheson — First Unitarian Church, Chicago, Ill.

Edward R. Bartlett — Ihiff School of Theology, Denver, Colo.

Edna M. Baxter — School of Religious Education, Hartford, Conn.

Elsie Bush — Director of Religious Education, Faith Congregational Church, Springfield, Mass.

Israel S. Chipkin — Vice President, Jewish Education Committee, New York City.

Stewart G. Cole — National Council of Christians and Jews, Los Angeles, Calif.

Wesner Fallaw — Andover-Newton Theological School, Newton Center, Mass.

George S. Ford — Corpus Christi Roman Catholic Church, New York City.

George Fox — Rabbi, South Shore Temple, Chicago, Ill.

Solomon B. Freehof — Rabbi, Rodef Shalom Temple, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Roma Gans — Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

Roland B. Gittlesohn — Rabbi, Rockville Centre, L. I.

Frank Grebe — Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City.

Mildred J. Greene — Director of Religious Education, Christ Church, New York City.

Hugh Hartshorne — Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Charles E. Hendry — University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont., Canada.

Ivar Hellstrom — Riverside Church, New York City.

Leo L. Honor — Drexel College, Philadelphia, Pa.

Walter Howlett — Greater New York Committee on Released Time, New York City.

F. Ernest Johnson — Division of Research and Survey, N.C.C.C. in the U.S.A., New York City.

Henry M. Johnson — Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Georgia.

Gerald E. Knoff — Division of Christian Education, N.C.C.C. in the U.S.A., Chicago, Ill.

Paul M. Limbert — Springfield College, Springfield, Mass.

E. R. MacLean — Ontario Religious Education Council, Toronto, Ont., Canada.

Donald M. Maynard — School of Theology, Boston University, Boston, Mass.

Judah Pilch — Executive Director, American Association for Jewish Education, New York City.

Erwin Shaver, Division of Christian Education, N.C.C.C. in the U.S.A., Chicago, Ill.

George N. Shuster — President, Hunter College, New York City.

Ross Snyder — Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

REGIONAL DIRECTORS

(Area Chairmen)

New England — Ernest W. Kuebler, American Unitarian Association, Boston, Mass.

Middle Atlantic — Samuel L. Hamilton, Chairman, Department of Religious Education, New York University, New York City.

Tri-State — Lawrence C. Little, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Southeast — Myron T. Hopper, College of Bible, Lexington, Ky.

Lake Michigan — Leon Fram, Rabbi, Temple Israel, Detroit 2.

Central — Charles F. Penniman, St. Louis, Missouri.

Southwest-Rocky Mountain — James Seehorn Seckler, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.

Pacific — Paul Irwin, School of Religion, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

(The Officers, Standing Committee Chairmen and the Regional Directors are also Members of Board of Directors)

